# Capitalism K
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#### The 1AC’s call for development creates the ocean as a new space for neoliberal capitalism

Steinberg (Department of Geography, Royal Holloway University of London) 10

(Philip E., Sekula, Allan and Noël Burch 2010 The Forgotten Space, reviewed by Philip E. Steinberg

<http://societyandspace.com/reviews/film-reviews/sekula/>)

In other words, in the capitalist imagination, the sea is idealized as a flat surface in which space is abstracted from geophysical reality. As the sea’s space is reduced to an abstract quantity of distance, or time, it is constructed as amenable to annihilation by technologies that enable the compression (or, better yet, the transcendence) of space-time, like the containership. While this construction of the ocean provides rich material for geographers of capitalism and modernity (e.g. Steinberg 2001), it provides precious little material for filmmakers. Under capitalism, the ocean is valued only in its (idealized) *absence*, and absence is notoriously difficult to film. Thus, as Brett Story, the other geographer who has commented on the film, has noted, ‘he film spends surprisingly little time on *actual* water’ (Story 2012, page 1576, emphasis added). By my count, only about ten minutes of the 110-minute film are spent at sea (all on the *Hanjin Budapest*) and even in this footage the material ocean is not a force that needs to be reckoned with, except as a source of rust.

For viewers who are familiar with Sekula’s book *Fish Story*, as well as with his other film *The Lottery of the Sea*, the relative absence of the ocean in *The Forgotten Space*is, as Story suggests, surprising. In contrast with *The Forgotten Space, Fish Story* begins with a meditation on the ‘crude materiality’ of the sea (Sekula 1995, page 12) and he reminds the reader throughout the book that the ocean’s materiality persists despite the best intentions of capital to wash it away. Thus, for instance, we learn in *Fish Story*that ‘large-scale material flows remain intractable. Acceleration is not absolute: the hydrodynamics of large-capacity hulls and the power output of diesel engines set a limit to the speed of cargo ships not far beyond that of the first quarter of [the twentieth] century’ (Sekula 1995, page 50). In *Fish Story*, the ocean is a space of *contradictions* and a non-human actor in its own right. However, no such references to the sea’s geophysical materiality and the barriers that this might pose to its idealization as a friction-free surface of movement appear in *The Forgotten Space*.

Human frictions on the sea likewise feature in *Fish Story*: militant seafarers, longshoremen, and mutineers all make appearances in the text. In contrast, these individuals receive scant attention in *The Forgotten Space*(a point noted by Story as well), and much of the attention that they do receive is about their failings. A relatively hopeful account of union organizing in Los Angeles is paired with a story of labour’s defeat in the face of automation in Rotterdam and that of a faded movement in Hong Kong where the union hall has become a social club for retirees and their widows.

For Sekula, the heterotopia of the ship celebrated by Foucault has become a neoliberal dystopia. The world of containerization is Foucault’s dreaded ‘civilization without boats, in which dreams have dried up, espionage has taken the place of adventure, and the police have taken the place of pirates’ (adapted from Foucault 1986, page 27). Echoing Foucault, Sekula asks near the beginning of the film, ‘Does the anonymity of the box turn the sea of exploit and adventure into a lake of invisible drudgery?’ Although Sekula never answers this question directly, his response would seem to be in the affirmative: the sea is no longer a romantic space of resistance; it has been tamed.

Sekula and Burch’s failure to depict the ocean as a space of dialectical encounters (whether between humans or among human and non-human elements) reproduces a dematerialization of the sea that is frequently found in narratives of globalization, including critical narratives (Steinberg 2013). This leads the filmmakers to inadvertently reaffirm the capitalist construction of the ocean as an external space beyond politics. By turning away from the frictions encountered at sea, Sekula and Birch end up tacitly endorsing the very ‘forgetting’ of the sea promoted by capital, as it subscribes to an ideology of limitless mobility.

#### And neoliberal capitalism makes economic collapse, inequality and extinction inevitable

Wise et al. (Director of Doctoral Program in Migration Studies & Prof of Development Studies; Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas, Mexico) 10

(Raúl Delgado Wise, Humberto Márquez Covarrubias, Rubén Puentes, Reframing the debate on migration, development and human rights: fundamental elements, October, 2010, www.migracionydesarrollo.org)

At the end of the first decade of the 21st century, a general crisis centered in the United States affected the global capitalist system on several levels (Márquez, 2009 and 2010). The consequences have been varied:

Financial. The overflowing of financial capital leads to speculative bubbles that affect the socioeconomic framework and result in global economic depressions. Speculative bubbles involve the bidding up of market prices of such commodities as real estate or electronic innovations far beyond their real value, leading inevitable to a subsequent slump (Foster and Magdof, 2009; Bello, 2006). Overproduction. Overproduction crises emerge when the surplus capital in the global economy is not channeled into production processes due to a fall in profit margins and a slump in effective demand, the latter mainly a consequence of wage containment across all sectors of the population (Bello, 2006). Environmental. Environmental degradation, climate change and a predatory approach to natural resources contribute to the destruction of the latter, along with a fundamental undermining of the material bases for production and human reproduction (Fola- dori and Pierri, 2005; Hinkelammert and Mora, 2008). Social. Growing social inequalities, the dismantling of the welfare state and dwindling means of subsistence accentuate problems such as poverty, unemployment, violence, insecurity and labor precariousness, increasing the pressure to emigrate (Harvey, 2007; Schierup, Hansen and Castles, 2006).

The crisis raises questions about the prevailing model of globalization and, in a deeper sense, the systemic global order, which currently undermines our main sources of wealth—labor and nature—and overexploits them to the extent that civilization itself is at risk. The responses to the crisis by the governments of developed countries and international agencies promoting globalization have been short-sighted and exclusivist. Instead of addressing the root causes of the crisis, they have implemented limited strategies that seek to rescue financial and manufacturing corporations facing bankruptcy. In addition, government policies of labor flexibilization and fiscal adjustment have affected the living and working conditions of most of the population. These measures are desperate attempts to prolong the privileges of ruling elites at the risk of imminent and increasingly severe crises. In these conditions, migrants have been made into scapegoats, leading to repressive anti- immigrant legislation and policies (Massey and Sánchez, 2006). A significant number of jobs have been lost while the conditions of remaining jobs deteriorate and deportations increase. Migrants’ living standards have drastically deteriorated but, contrary to expectations, there have been neither massive return flows nor a collapse in remittances, though there is evidence that migrant worker flows have indeed diminished.

#### Our alternative is to reject the Aff’s endorsement of market based development.

#### Rejecting market competition is an act of economic imagination that can create real alternatives within the existing economy

White and Williams (senior lecturer of economic geography at Sheffield Hallam University; professor of public policy in the Management School at the University of Sheffield) 12

(Richard J. and Cohn C., Escaping Capitalist Hegemony: Rereading Western Economies in The Accumulation of Freedom, pg. 131-32)

The American anarchist Howard Ehrlich argued, "We must act as if the future is today." What we have hoped to demonstrate here is that non‑capitalist spaces are present and evident in contemporary societies. We do not need to imagine and create from scratch new economic alternatives that will successfully confront the capitalist hegemony thesis, or more properly the capitalist hegemony myth. Rather than capitalism being the all powerful, all conquering, economic juggernaut, the greater truth is that the "other" non‑capitalist spaces have grown in proportion relative in size to the capitalism realm.

This should give many of us great comfort and hope in moving forward purposefully for, as Chomsky observed: "[a]lternatives have to be constructed within the existing economy, and within the minds of working people and communities."' In this regard, the roots of the heterodox economic futures that we desire do exist in the present. Far from shutting down future economic possibilities, a more accurate reading of "the economic" (which decenters capitalism), coupled with the global crisis that capitalism finds itself in, should give us additional courage and resolve to unleash our economic imaginations, embrace the challenge of creating "fully engaged" economies. These must also take greater account of the disastrous social and environmental costs of capitalism and its inherent ethic of competition. As Kropotkin wrote:

Don't compete!‑competition is always injurious to the species, and you have plenty of resources to avoid it! Therefore combine‑practice mutual aid! That is the surest means for giving to each and all to the greatest safety, the best guarantee of existence and progress, bodily, intellectual, and moral .... That is what Nature teaches us; and that is what all those animals which have attained the highest position in the respective classes have done. That is also what man [ski‑the most primitive man‑has been doing; and that is why man has reached the position upon which we stand now."

A more detailed and considered discussion of the futures of work, however, is beyond the scope of this chapter. What we have hoped to demonstrate is that in reimagining the economic, and recognizing and valuing the non‑capitalist economic practices that are already here, we might spark renewed enthusiasm, optimism, insight, and critical discussion within and among anarchist communities. The ambition here is similar to that of Gibson‑Graham, in arguing that:

The objective is not to produce a finished and coherent template that maps the economy "as it really is" and presents... a ready made "alternative economy." Rather, our hope is to disarm and dislocate the naturalized dominance of the capitalist economy and make a space for new economic beeomings‑ones that we will need to work to produce. If we can recognize a diverse economy, we can begin to imagine and create diverse organizations and practices as powerful constituents of an enlivened noncapitalist policies of place.

# \*\*\*Links\*\*\*

## Green Economy Link

The green economy guarantees environmental destruction

Via Campesinos 12

(Nyeleni Newsletter, Number 10, June 2012, nyeleni.org)

This June in Rio de Janeiro the *United Nations Conference on Sustainable Develop-* *ment Rio+20* will be held, marking two decades since the Earth Summit. The “green” economy will be the main theme of discussion and debates at the *Rio+20 summit*, this concept represents a way of transforming the environmental crisis into a tool for capital accumulation – considering that in current times the capitalist system regards markets as the primary medium for responding to the global environmental crisis, and the *green*  *economy* marks an attempt to make this system appear “sustainable”. The current edi- tion of the *Nyéléni Newsletter* opens and invites discussion on the *green economy*, add- ing various elements to the debate and providing alternatives. What is certainly clear is that international capital is organizing to appropriate territories, to transform nature into another form of merchandise, all the while increasing exploitation and privatization. The “*green*” *economy* elevates the principles of commerce and profit above any form of social consideration, above even the reproduction of life itself. *Our challenge is to*  *continue building on our mobilization capacities in our territories, based on solidarity,*  *internationalism and the integration of peoples to convert our struggles in realities.* In response to the worrying evidence of an ecological crisis, in 1983 the United Nations established the *World Commission on Environment and Development* to investigate the connection between the depletion of the environment and development. In 1987 the Commission published a report called *Our Common Future*1, better known as the Brundtland Report. The new concept of Sustainable Development was launched (Box 3) and became the basis of the negotiations at the *Earth Summit* in 19922. Governments at the Earth Summit agreed to establish a number of multilateral struc- tures- including the UNFCCC (Global Climate negotiations), the CBD (the Convention on Biological Diversity) and others. All of these instruments have failed in the last twenty years to address the Earth’s ecological crises. Even worse, the world now faces unprecedented inancial, food, energy and environmental threats caused by the development model of a capitalist system based on in infinite growth which Rio in 1992 failed to question. Despite this, the agenda for Rio +20 is quite clear – govern- ments and transnational corporations (TNCs) are promoting a new framework to take advantage of the crisis and promote new ways of making pro it. They are calling it the *“green” economy.*  It may have an appealing name but in reality thegreen economy is an attack to the commons, on peoples’ rights and on nature itself. The *Green Economy* includes a wide range of proposals3 that can be summarized in two trends. On one hand, it pro- motes the development of a *‘post-fossil fuel’ bio-economy* based on the exploitation of biomass (forests, soils, plants and microbes – de inition box 1). The biomass will be used both as fuel and as raw material from which to manufacture a wide range of prod- ucts, including plastics, chemicals and pharmaceuticals – through the employment of hazardous new technologies. This means a more intense use of natural resources (the biomass), that will cause – as already occurred with agrofuels production4 - more land- grabbing, monoculture, water depletion, soil and biodiversity degradation. On the other hand, the Green Economy embraces the “protection” of ecosystems and biodiversity through the commodification and privatization of nature and the use of new financial mechanisms. At irst the two trends seem contradictory, but both illustrate the clever attempt of corporations to ind new business opportunities and to secure access to land and natural resources5. The *Green Economy* is an assortment of different proposals that will succeed only if supported by an international framework of policies that endorse it and subsidize the private agents involved. The *Earth Summit* is the perfect place to get the necessary international commitment and legitimization. This is why it is also the key time to stop them.

A neoliberal green revolution simply shifts to domination and exploitation into other spheres

**White** (post-doctoral research fellow in the School of Cultural and Innovation Studies, University of East London) **2**

(Damian, A Green Industrial Revolution? Sustainable Technological Innovation in a Global Age, Environmental Politics, Vo1.II. No.2, Summer 2002. pp.I-26)

The first point is essentially negative. Notably, it draws attention to the fact that even if all the obstacles to a green industrial revolution posed by the structuring of the current political economy are addressed - ifthere are notforces to make things differently - the type of eco-technological and ecoindustrial reorganisation that triumphs could simply serve and reinforce the patterns of interest of dominant groups. A neo-liberal version of the 'green industrial revolution' could simply give rise to eco-technologies and forms of industrial reorganisation that arc perfectly compatible with extending social control, military power, worker surveillance and the broader repressive capacities of dominant groups and institutions. It might even be that a corporate dominated green industrial revolution would simply ensure that employers have 'smart' buildings which not only give energy back to the national grid but allow for new 'solar powered' employee surveillance technologies. What of a sustainable military-industrial complex that uses green warfare technologies that kill human beings without destroying ecosystems? To what extent might a 'nonhero' dominated green industrial revolution simply ensure that the South receives ecotechnologies that primarily express Northern interests (for example, embedding relations of dependency rather than of self management and autonomy?). In short then, a green industrial revolution could simply give rise to new forms of 'green governmentality' [Dorier et aI., 1999].

## Incentives Link –

### General 1NC (Long)

Relying on incentives structures makes environmental destruction and market competition inevitable

Adaman and Madra (Bogazici University, Department of Economics) 12

(Fikret & Yahya M., Understanding Neoliberalism as Economization: The Case of the Ecology, http://www.econ.boun.edu.tr/public\_html/RePEc/pdf/201204.pdf)

In the aftermath of the 2008 financial crisis, governments and international finance organizations began to call for and take regulatory measures in order to prevent similar breakdowns in the future, causing some commentators to quickly pronounce neoliberalism dead. Consider, for instance, a most recent example: while writing this chapter, a special report in the January 21-27, 2012, issue of The Economist—embellished with a red and black portrait of Lenin on the cover, triumphantly holding a cigar with a dollar sign on it—lamented the “emerging world’s new model” would be “the rise of state capitalism.” Yet, this line of argument is based on a rather simplified and narrow reading of neoliberalism, as a purer laissezfaire regime where spontaneous markets reign free with minimal role for governments. A closer look at the brief history of neoliberalism challenges this reading of neoliberalism as a project/process of marketization on both the practical and the ideational levels. Practically speaking, governments have always played an active role in designing, instituting and facilitating the operation of markets, not only before but also under neoliberalism. In other words, the historical track record of three decades of neoliberal hegemony at a global scale demonstrates that the much invoked dichotomy between state and private capitalism fails to do justice to the intensity and the depth of dirigiste and technocratic bureaucratic state involvement in implementing neoliberalism (Harvey, 2005; Peck, 2010). In fact, if we were to follow the directions proposed back in the end of the 1970s by Michel Foucault (2008) in his prescient genealogy of neoliberal reason, at the ideational level, neoliberal “turn” in economic thinking, quite distinct from the earlier, late 18 th -century classical liberalism which aimed at protecting the markets from the arbitrary interventions of the state, represents a particular epistemic shift in the way the governments relate to and regulate the entire ensemble of social relations through a governmental matrix which is organized around the assumption that all social agents (be they individuals, groups, enterprises, or states) are calculatively rational and calculably responsive towards (pecuniary or otherwise) incentives. In other words, if neoliberalism is not (only) a drive towards marketization, but rather more broadly a drive towards the economization of the ensemble of social relations (viz. the economic, the cultural, the political, and the ecological) through governmental dispositifs, then it would be misleading to deduce the death of neoliberalism from the increasing visibility of state involvement in the economy and society at large without asking how that involvement is epistemically organized and whether or not it successfully transforms social ontology in the direction of economization (Madra and Adaman, 2010).

If one were to subscribe to this reading of neoliberalism as a drive towards economization of the economic, political, social, and ecological spheres, one could plausibly argue in our current conjuncture that, despite the fact that the economic recession is still going strong in North America and Europe, leading to political crises in Southern Europe (Greece, Spain, and Italy) and potentially to the dissolution of the Euro-zone, neoliberalism remains hegemonic. In response to this persistent crisis, governments are electing not to return to a Keynesian-style demand-management policy through deficit- or, better yet, progressive taxation-based spending policy (as advocated by the likes of Joseph Stiglitz [2010]), and continue to advocate and actually implement austerity programs despite widespread popular unrest and opposition. But more importantly, while only a small fraction within the neoliberal field still defend the market panacea paradigm unequivocally, there is very little questioning of the economizing and calculative ideologies of the neoliberal social ontological project. In this chapter, our aim is to shed some light on how the neoliberal project reproduces itself theoretically and practically in the context of the government of the ecology. Given the everdeepening dual crises of environmental pollution and the over-use of natural resources (including the exhaustion of non-renewable energy and material sources), unveiling the relationship between neoliberalism and ecological degradation—at both theoretical and policy levels—is crucial. Currently, the privatization of natural resources (viz. natural parks, forests) is being promoted; financial markets are finding their way into environmental policy and conservation (viz. payments for ecosystem services, biodiversity derivatives, species banking and carbon trade); and incentive schemes are being designed to provide the right signal to agents in their relationship with ecology (viz. the price-per-bag policy for household waste). Critically engaging with these numerous policies and their ideological sources will be possible only if one subscribes to the understanding of neoliberalism as a project of economization as outlined above. This constitutes the essence of this chapter.

More specifically, the chapter argues that the global spread of neoliberalism as a set of ideas, interpretative grids, governmental interfaces, and institutional dispositifs in relation to ecology is premised on the conceptualization of human behavior from a certain perspective, according to which the capacity of agents in understanding and responding to economic incentives is taken as a postulate, and every human decision is assumed reducible to a mere cost-benefit analysis. The chapter reads the widespread and resilient hold of the neoliberal epistemic grid within theory and policy-making by situating it, or “embedding” it, within the historical context of intellectual continuities between neoliberal policies towards the use of ecology and the general postwar intellectual legacy of neoliberalism within the mainstream of the discipline of economics. For this purpose, it traces the historical genealogy of neoliberal reasoning back to the establishment of the Mont-Pèlerin Society in order to defend the idea of free market against the post-Great Depression hegemony of the Keynesian welfare state capitalism (the Beveridge Plan in the UK, New Deal in the USA, developmentalism in the Third World), by discussing the links, affinities, and differences among not only the usually-recognized Austrian, Chicago, and Virginia Schools, but also, and perhaps more controversially, the left-leaning and egalitarian post-Walrasian, or better-known as “mechanism-design,” approach. Indeed, the latter set of approaches, because they highlight the limits and failures of markets (arising mainly due to informational asymmetries) and advocate for the regulation of markets and the design and institution of “incentive-compatible” mechanisms that would substitute for markets, tend to be read as alternatives to the neoliberal creed. Nevertheless, what appears as an alternative from the neoliberalism-qua-marketization perspective, can be considered only as a variant from the perspective of our understanding of neoliberalism as a project/process of economization. The common thread that has held these diverse groups of intellectual networks together, the chapter argues, is the ultimate belief that relying on economic incentives would indeed produce a prosperous and harmonious society. In sum, this chapter invites the reader to understand neoliberalism as a governmental epistemic grid that aims to performatively bring to existence a particular calculative and calculable organization of the entire social field, including the ecology—as a governmental logic, while undoubtedly including marketization and privatization among its policy options, exhaustively entailing the economization of the political, the cultural and the natural, and performatively promoting calculative (and therefore calculable) behavior across all fields.

### Incentives Link – General 1NC (Short)

Incentives structures reenforce biopolitical neoliberalism

Adaman and Madra (Bogazici University, Department of Economics) 12

(Fikret & Yahya M., Understanding Neoliberalism as Economization: The Case of the Ecology, http://www.econ.boun.edu.tr/public\_html/RePEc/pdf/201204.pdf)

Michel Foucault’s close reading of some of the key texts of neoliberal thought at his 1979 lectures at the Collège de France (Foucault, 2008; see also Tribe, 2009) moves beyond the popular representations of neoliberalism that reduce it to a set of marketization policies. According to Foucault, neoliberalism is a response to the historical unfolding of a constitutive tension of liberal governmental reason: how might one extend the realm of freedom without inadvertently delimiting it with governmental interventions that are necessary for the extension of the realm of freedom? In contrast to classical liberalism that tried to limit government control over markets, neoliberalism answers this question by aiming at nothing less than modeling “the overall exercise of political power” on the competitive logic of markets (Foucault, 2008: 131). The emergence of neoliberalism, according to Foucault, heralds the birth of a new art of government, a “biopolitical mode of governmentality,” where the state ceases to relate to its subjects as citizen-subjects with social rights, and begins to conduct its functions under the presumption that subjects will respond (predictably) to economic incentives in all aspects of their lives. In short, neoliberalism, as a combination of an ideological discourse and practices, entails a push towards a de-politicization of the social through its economization—viz. imposing a logic of cost-benefit analysis to all aspects of life under the assumption that everything is commodifiable (see also Fine and Milonakis, 2009).

This is the MO of neoliberalism

Adaman and Madra (Bogazici University, Department of Economics) 12

(Fikret & Yahya M., Understanding Neoliberalism as Economization: The Case of the Ecology, http://www.econ.boun.edu.tr/public\_html/RePEc/pdf/201204.pdf)

Neoliberal reason is therefore not simply about market expansion and the withdrawal of the welfare state, but more broadly about reconfiguring the state and its functions so that the state governs its subjects through a filter of economic incentives rather than direct coercion. In other words, supposed subjects of the neoliberal state are not citizen-subjects with political and social rights, but rather economic subjects who are supposed to comprehend (hence, calculative) and respond predictably (hence, calculable) to economic incentives (and disincentives). There are mainly two ways in which states under the sway of neoliberal reason aim to manipulate the conduct of their subjects. The first is through markets, or market-like incentive-compatible institutional mechanisms that economic experts design based on the behaviorist assumption that economic agents respond predictably to economic (but not necessarily pecuniary) incentives, to achieve certain discrete objectives. The second involves a revision of the way the bureaucracy functions. Here, the neoliberal reason functions as an internal critique of the way bureaucratic dispositifs organize themselves: The typical modus operandi of this critique is to submit the bureaucracy to efficiency audits and subsequently advocate the subcontracting of various functions of the state to the private sector either by fullblown privatization or by public-private partnerships.

### Incentives Link – General 2NC

Incentive structures force individuals into a neoliberal subjectivity

Read (University of Southern Maine) 9

(Jason, The University of Southern Maine, A Genealogy of Homo-Economicus: Neoliberalism and the Production of Subjectivity, Foucault Studies, No 6, pp. 25-36, February 2009)

In order to frame Foucault’s analysis it is useful to begin with how he sees the distinction between liberalism and neoliberalism. For Foucault, this difference has to do with the different ways in which they each focus on economic activity. Classical liberalism focused on exchange, on what Adam Smith called ~~man~~kind’s tendency to “barter, truck, and exchange.” It naturalized the market as a system with its own rationality, its own interest, and its own specific efficiency, arguing ultimately for its superior efficiency as a distributor of goods and services. The market became a space of autonomy that had to be carved out of the state through the unconditional right of private property. What Foucault stresses in his understanding, is the way in which the market becomes more than just a specific institution or practice to the point where it has become the basis for a reinterpretation and thus a critique of state power. Classical liberalism makes exchange the general matrix of society. It establishes a homology: just as relations in the marketplace can be understood as an exchange of certain freedoms for a set of rights and liberties.4 Neoliberalism, according to Foucault, extends the process of making economic activity a general matrix of social and political relations, but it takes as its focus not exchange but competition.5 What the two forms of liberalism, the “classical” and “neo” share, according to Foucault, is a general idea of “homo economicus,” that is, the way in which they place a particular “anthropology” of ~~man~~ as an economic subject at the basis of politics. What changes is the emphasis from an anthropology of exchange to one of competition. The shift from exchange to competition has profound effects: while exchange was considered to be natural, competition is understood by the neo-liberals of the twentieth century to be an artificial relation that must be protected against the tendency for markets to form monopolies and interventions by the state. Competition necessitates a constant intervention on the part of the state, not on the market, but on the conditions of the market.6 What is more important for us is the way in which this shift in “anthropology” from “homo economicus” as an exchanging creature to a competitive creature, or rather as a creature whose tendency to compete must be fostered, entails a general shift in the way in which human beings make themselves and are made subjects.

First, neoliberalism entails a massive expansion of the field and scope of economics. Foucault cites Gary Becker on this point: “Economics is the science which studies human behavior as relationship between ends and scarce means which have alternate uses.” 7 Everything for which human beings attempt to realize their ends, from marriage, to crime, to expenditures on children, can be understood “economically” according to a particular calculation of cost for benefit. Secondly, this entails a massive redefinition of “labor” and the “worker.” The worker has become “human capital”. Salary or wages become the revenue that is earned on an initial investment, an investment in one’s skills or abilities. Any activity that increases the capacity to earn income, to achieve satisfaction, even migration, the crossing of borders from one country to another, is an investment in human capital. Of course a large portion of “human capital,” one’s body, brains, and genetic material, not to mention race or class, is simply given and cannot be improved. Foucault argues that this natural limit is something that exists to be overcome through technologies; from plastic surgery to possible genetic engineering that make it possible to transform one’s initial investment. As Foucault writes summarizing this point of view: “Homo economicus is an entrepreneur, an entrepreneur of ~~himself~~.”8 Foucault’s object in his analysis is not to bemoan this as a victory for capitalist ideology, the point at which the “ruling ideas” have truly become the ideas of the “ruling class,” so much so that everyone from a minimum wage employee to a C.E.O. considers themselves to be entrepreneurs. Nor is his task to critique the fundamental increase of the scope of economic rationality in neo-liberal economics: the assertion that economics is coextensive with all of society, all of rationality, and that it is economics “all the way down.” Rather, Foucault takes the neo-liberal ideal to be a new regime of truth, and a new way in which people are made subjects: homo economicus is fundamentally different subject, structured by different motivations and governed by different principles, than homo juridicus, or the legal subject of the state. Neoliberalism constitutes a new mode of “governmentality,” a manner, or a mentality, in which people are governed and govern themselves. The operative terms of this governmentality are no longer rights and laws but interest, investment and competition. Whereas rights exist to be exchanged, and are some sense constituted through the original exchange of the social contract, interest is irreducible and inalienable, it cannot be exchanged. The state channels flows of interest and desire by making desirable activities inexpensive and undesirable activities costly, counting on the fact that subjects calculate their interests. As a form of governmentality, neoliberalism would seem paradoxically to govern without governing; that is, in order to function its subjects must have a great deal of freedom to act—to choose between competing strategies. The new governmental reason needs freedom; therefore, the new art of government consumes freedom. It must produce it, it must organize it. The new art of government therefore appears as the management of freedom, not in the sense of the imperative: “be free,” with the immediate contradiction that this imperative may contain...[T]he liberalism we can describe as the art of government formed in the eighteenth century entails at its heart a productive/destructive relationship with freedom. Liberalism must produce freedom, but this very act entails the establishment of limitations, controls, forms of coercion, and obligations relying on threats, etcetera.9 These freedoms, the freedoms of the market, are not the outside of politics, of governmentality, as its limit, but rather are an integral element of its strategy. As a mode of governmentality, neoliberalism operates on interests, desires, and aspirations rather than through rights and obligations; it does not directly mark the body, as sovereign power, or even curtail actions, as disciplinary power; rather, it acts on the conditions of actions. Thus, neoliberal governmentality follows a general trajectory of intensification.This trajectory follows a fundamental paradox; as power becomes less restrictive, less corporeal, it also becomes more intense, saturating the field of actions, and possible actions. 10 Foucault limits his discussion of neoliberalism to its major theoretical texts and paradigms, following its initial formulation in post-war Germany through to its most comprehensive version in the Chicago School. Whereas Foucault’s early analyses are often remembered for their analysis of practical documents, the description of the panopticon or the practice of the confessional, the lectures on “neoliberalism” predominantly follow the major theoretical discussions. This is in some sense a limitation of the lecture course format, or at least a reflection that this material was never developed into a full study. Any analysis that is faithful to the spirit and not just the letter of Foucault’s text would focus on its existence as a practice and not just a theory diffused throughout the economy, state, and society. As Thomas Lemke argues, neoliberalism is a political project that attempts to create a social reality that it suggests already exists, stating that competition is the basis of social relations while fostering those same relations.11The contemporary trend away from long term labor contracts, towards temporary and part-time labor, is not only an effective economic strategy, freeing corporations from contracts and the expensive commitments of health care and other benefits, it is an effective strategy of subjectification as well. It encourages workers to see themselves not as “workers” in a political sense, who have something to gain through solidarity and collective organization, but as “companies of one.” They become individuals for whom every action, from taking courses on a new computer software application to having their teeth whitened, can be considered an investment in human capital. As Eric Alliez and Michel Feher write: “Corporations’ massive recourse to subcontracting plays a fundamental role in this to the extent that it turns the workers’ desire for independence...into a ‘business spirit’ that meets capital’s growing need for satellites.”12 Neoliberalism is not simply an ideology in the pejorative sense of the term, or a belief that one could elect to have or not have, but is itself produced by strategies, tactics, and policies that create subjects of interest, locked in competition. Because Foucault brackets what could be considered the “ideological” dimension of neoliberalism, its connection with the global hegemony of not only capitalism, but specifically a new regime of capitalist accumulation, his lectures have little to say about its historical conditions. Foucault links the original articulation of neoliberalism to a particular reaction to Nazi Germany. As Foucault argues, the original neo-liberals, the “Ordo-liberals,” considered Nazi Germany not to be an effect of capitalism. But the most extreme version of what is opposed to capitalism and the market—planning. While Foucault’s analysis captures the particular “fear of the state” that underlies neoliberalism, its belief that any planning, any intervention against competition, is tantamount to totalitarianism. It however does not account for the dominance of neoliberalism in the present, specifically its dominance as a particular “technology of the self,” a particular mode of subjection. At the same time, Foucault offers the possibility of a different understanding of the history of neoliberalism when he argues that neoliberalism, or the neo-liberal subject as homo economicus, or homo entrepreneur, emerges to address a particular lacunae in liberal economic thought, and that is labor. In this sense neoliberalism rushes to fill the same void, the same gap, that Marx attempted to fill, without reference to Marx, and with very different results.13 Marx and neo-liberals agree that although classical economic theory examined the sphere of exchange, the market, it failed to enter the “hidden abode of production” examining how capital is produced. Of course the agreement ends there, because what Marx and neo-liberals find in labor is fundamentally different: for Marx labor is the sphere of exploitation while for the neo-liberals, as we have seen, labor is no sooner introduced as a problem than the difference between labor and capital is effaced through the theory of “human capital.”14 Neoliberalism scrambles and exchanges the terms of opposition between “worker” and “capitalist.” To quote Etienne Balibar, “The capitalist is defined as worker, as an ‘entrepreneur’; the worker, as the bearer of a capacity, of a human capital.”15 Labor is no longer limited to the specific sites of the factory or the workplace, but is any activity that works towards desired ends. The terms “labor” and “human capital” intersect, overcoming in terminology their longstanding opposition; the former becomes the activity and the latter becomes the effects of the activity, its history. From this intersection the discourse of the economy becomes an entire way of life, a common sense in which every action--crime, marriage, higher education and so on--can be charted according to a calculus of maximum output for minimum expenditure; it can be seen as an investment. Thus situating Marx and neoliberalism with respect to a similar problem makes it possible to grasp something of the politics of neoliberalism, which through a generalization of the idea of the “entrepreneur,” “investment” and “risk” beyond the realm of finance capital to every quotidian relation, effaces the very fact of exploitation. Neoliberalism can be considered a particular version of “capitalism without capitalism,” a way of maintaining not only private property but the existing distribution of wealth in capitalism while simultaneously doing away with the antagonism and social insecurity of capitalism, in this case paradoxically by extending capitalism, at least its symbols, terms, and logic, to all of society. The opposition between capitalist and worker has been effaced not by a transformation of the mode of production, a new organization of the production and distribution of wealth, but by the mode of subjection, a new production of subjectivity. Thus, neoliberalism entails a very specific extension of the economy across all of society; it is not, as Marx argued, because everything rests on an economic base (at least in the last instance) that the effects of the economy are extended across of all of society, rather it is an economic perspective, that of the market, that becomes coextensive with all of society. As Christian Laval argues, all actions are seen to conform to the fundamental economic ideas of self-interest, of greatest benefit for least possible cost. It is not the structure of the economy that is extended across society but the subject of economic thinking, its implicit anthropology.16

### Incentives Link – Energy 1NC

Relying on market mechanisms to facilitate the energy transition make warming, international competition, structural violence and war inevitable

Abramsky (visiting fellow at the Institute of Advanced Studies in Science, Technology and Society; fmr. coordinator of the Danish‑based World Wind Energy Institute) 10

(Koyla, Racing to "Save" the Economy and the Planet: Capitalist or Post­ capitalist Transition to a Post‑petrol World?, in Sparking A Worldwide Energy Revolution, ed. Koyla Abramsky, pg. 26-7)

The fact that coal and oil are finite resources means that there is a long‑term tendency in the direction of their phase‑out, regardless of what intentional short‑term interventions are carried out or not. Many proponents of renewable energy simply advocate leaving this phase‑6ut process to the market. It is hoped that rising oil and coal prices will make these fuels increasingly less attractive. Efforts are focused on developing a renewable energy sector that is able to compete, rather than directly confronting, suppressing, and ultimately dismantling the coal and oil industries. However, leaving the phase‑out of oil and coal to the market has at least three crucial implications.

First, such a phase‑out is likely to actually prolong the use of fossil fuels. As long as these energy sources are profitable to extract and to use, they will be. Down to the last remaining drops of oil or lumps of coal. Although resources are finite, they are still relatively abundant Even those analysts who give the most pessimistic (though realistic) perspectives on resource availability, such as those included in this book, do not predict a complete exhaustion of resources in the very near future. And, from the perspective of climate change, a prolongation of fossil fuel use is the exact opposite of what needs to happen, phase‑out must be sped up, not prolonged.

Linked to this, the second consequence of a market‑based phase‑out of oil and coal will mean that the remaining oil and coal resources are frittered away for immediate profit rather than to build the infrastructure for a transition process. Given that building a new energy system will require massive amounts of energy inputs in a very concentrated period of time, this is a recipe for disaster.

The third important consequence is that leaving the transition process to the market is likely to be increasingly coercive and conductive if competition is left to determine who controls the last of these resources and for what purposes they are used. This means competition between workers globally, competition between firnis, and competition between states. This translates to massive inequalities, hierarchies, and austerity measures being imposed on labor (both in and outside the energy sectan); massive bankruptcies of smaller firms and concentration and centralization of capital; and last, but not least, military conflicts between states.

Accepting a market‑based phase out of oil and coal is accepting in advance that the rising price of energy and a transition away from coal and oil is paid by labor and not capital, when in actual fact the question of who pays still remains to be determined. The answer will only come through a process of collective global struggle, which occurs along class lines within the world‑economy. It is important to correctly identify these lines of struggle at the outset, otherwise it will be a struggle lost before the fight even begins. Collectively planning energy use and fossil fuel phase‑out is proving to be an enormously difficult social process, but it is likely to be far less socially regressive if based on cooperation, solidarity, and collectively‑defined social needs, rather than if it is based around competition and profit.

2NC-Overview

This neoliberal spread makes environmental and economic collapse inevitable

**Wise et al.** (Director of Doctoral Program in Migration Studies & Prof of Development Studies; Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas, Mexico) **10**

(Raúl Delgado Wise, Humberto Márquez Covarrubias, Rubén Puentes, Reframing the debate on migration, development and human rights: fundamental elements, October, 2010, www.migracionydesarrollo.org)

The internationalization of capital. The expansion strategy of the global economy in- volves a profound economic restructuring based on the establishment of subcontracting chains dominated by large multinational corporations, which have a global reach. This form of expansion seeks to economically reinsert peripheral countries that are rich in natural resources and ensure an abundant and cheap workforce. The new export platforms, in fact, operate as enclaves, that is production, commercial and services zones dominated by multinational corporations and often exempted from national taxation and regulation of working and environmental conditions. These types of plants cur- rently employ between 55 million (Robinson, 2008) and 66 million Southern workers (Singa Boyenge, 2006) and the strategy is widely implemented by large manufacturing, financial, agricultural, commercial, and service-sector multinationals (Robinson, 2008). Financialization. Financial capital generates speculative strategies that foster the chan- neling of investment funds, sovereign funds, pension funds and social savings toward new financial instruments that offer short-term high profit margins but can entail re- current crises and massive fraud. These speculative strategies obstruct and affect the functioning of the so-called real economy (Foster and Magdof, 2009; Bello, 2006). Environmental degradation. Biodiversity, natural resources, and communal and national wealth are privatized for the benefit of large corporations that favor profits while ignoring social and environmental costs. This leads to increased environmental degradation, pollution, famine, and disease, as well as climate changes (global warming and increasingly frequent extreme climatic events) that threaten the symbiotic relationship between humans and the environment (Foladori and Pierri, 2005).

Capitalism makes oceanic and human extinction inevitable

Clark and Clausen (teaches sociology at North Carolina State University in Raleigh; teaches sociology at Fort Lewis College) 8

(Brett and Rebecca, The Oceanic Crisis: Capitalism and the Degradation of Marine Ecosystem, 2008, Volume 60, Issue 03 (July-August)

The world is at a crossroads in regard to the ecological crisis. Ecological degradation under global capitalism extends to the entire biosphere. Oceans that were teeming with abundance are being decimated by the continual intrusion of exploitive economic operations. At the same time that scientists are documenting the complexity and interdependency of marine species, we are witnessing an oceanic crisis as natural conditions, ecological processes, and nutrient cycles are being undermined through overfishing and transformed due to global warming.

The expansion of the accumulation system, along with technological advances in fishing, have intensified the exploitation of the world ocean; facilitated the enormous capture of fishes (both target and bycatch); extended the spatial reach of fishing operations; broadened the species deemed valuable on the market; and disrupted metabolic and reproductive processes of the ocean. The quick-fix solution of aquaculture enhances capital’s control over production without resolving ecological contradictions.

It is wise to recognize, as Paul Burkett has stated, that “short of human extinction, there is no sense in which capitalism can be relied upon to permanently ‘break down’ under the weight of its depletion and degradation of natural wealth.”44 Capital is driven by the competition for the accumulation of wealth, and short-term profits provide the immediate pulse of capitalism. It cannot operate under conditions that require reinvestment in the reproduction of nature, which may entail time scales of a hundred or more years. Such requirements stand opposed to the immediate interests of profit.

The qualitative relation between humans and nature is subsumed under the drive to accumulate capital on an ever-larger scale. Marx lamented that to capital, “Time is everything, man is nothing; he is at the most, time’s carcase. Quality no longer matters. Quantity alone decides everything.”45 Productive relations are concerned with production time, labor costs, and the circulation of capital—not the diminishing conditions of existence. Capital subjects natural cycles and processes (via controlled feeding and the use of growth hormones) to its economic cycle. The maintenance of natural conditions is not a concern. The bounty of nature is taken for granted and appropriated as a free gift.

As a result, the system is inherently caught in a fundamental crisis arising from the transformation and destruction of nature. István Mészáros elaborates this point, stating:

For today it is impossible to think of anything at all concerning the elementary conditions of social metabolic reproduction which is not lethally threatened by the way in which capital relates to them—the only way in which it can. This is true not only of humanity’s energy requirements, or of the management of the planet’s mineral resources and chemical potentials, but of every facet of the global agriculture, including the devastation caused by large scale de-forestation, and even the most irresponsible way of dealing with the element without which no human being can survive: water itself….In the absence of miraculous solutions, capital’s arbitrarily self-asserting attitude to the objective determinations of causality and time in the end inevitably brings a bitter harvest, at the expense of humanity [and nature itself].46

An analysis of the oceanic crisis confirms the destructive qualities of private for-profit operations. Dire conditions are being generated as the resiliency of marine ecosystems in general is being undermined.

To make matters worse, sewage from feedlots and fertilizer runoff from farms are transported by rivers to gulfs and bays, overloading marine ecosystems with excess nutrients, which contribute to an expansion of algal production. This leads to oxygen-poor water and the formation of hypoxic zones—otherwise known as “dead zones” because crabs and fishes suffocate within these areas. It also compromises natural processes that remove nutrients from the waterways. Around 150 dead zones have been identified around the world. A dead zone is the end result of unsustainable practices of food production on land. At the same time, it contributes to the loss of marine life in the seas, furthering the ecological crisis of the world ocean.

Coupled with industrialized capitalist fisheries and aquaculture, the oceans are experiencing ecological degradation and constant pressures of extraction that are severely depleting the populations of fishes and other marine life. The severity of the situation is that if current practices and rates of fish capture continue marine ecosystems and fisheries around the world could collapse by the year 2050.47 To advert turning the seas into a watery grave, what is needed is nothing less than a worldwide revolution in our relation to nature, and thus of global society itself.

# \*\*\*Impact\*\*\*

## Laundry List Impact

Makes social inequality and exn inevitable

Wise et al. (Director of Doctoral Program in Migration Studies & Prof of Development Studies; Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas, Mexico) 10

(Raúl Delgado Wise, Humberto Márquez Covarrubias, Rubén Puentes, Reframing the debate on migration, development and human rights: fundamental elements, October, 2010, www.migracionydesarrollo.org)

At the end of the first decade of the 21st century, a general crisis centered in the United States affected the global capitalist system on several levels (Márquez, 2009 and 2010). The consequences have been varied:

Financial. The overflowing of financial capital leads to speculative bubbles that affect the socioeconomic framework and result in global economic depressions. Speculative bubbles involve the bidding up of market prices of such commodities as real estate or electronic innovations far beyond their real value, leading inevitable to a subsequent slump (Foster and Magdof, 2009; Bello, 2006). Overproduction. Overproduction crises emerge when the surplus capital in the global economy is not channeled into production processes due to a fall in profit margins and a slump in effective demand, the latter mainly a consequence of wage containment across all sectors of the population (Bello, 2006). Environmental. Environmental degradation, climate change and a predatory approach to natural resources contribute to the destruction of the latter, along with a fundamental undermining of the material bases for production and human reproduction (Fola- dori and Pierri, 2005; Hinkelammert and Mora, 2008). Social. Growing social inequalities, the dismantling of the welfare state and dwindling means of subsistence accentuate problems such as poverty, unemployment, violence, insecurity and labor precariousness, increasing the pressure to emigrate (Harvey, 2007; Schierup, Hansen and Castles, 2006).

The crisis raises questions about the prevailing model of globalization and, in a deeper sense, the systemic global order, which currently undermines our main sources of wealth—labor and nature—and overexploits them to the extent that civilization itself is at risk. The responses to the crisis by the governments of developed countries and international agencies promoting globalization have been short-sighted and exclusivist. Instead of addressing the root causes of the crisis, they have implemented limited strategies that seek to rescue financial and manufacturing corporations facing bankruptcy. In addition, government policies of labor flexibilization and fiscal adjustment have affected the living and working conditions of most of the population. These measures are desperate attempts to prolong the privileges of ruling elites at the risk of imminent and increasingly severe crises. In these conditions, migrants have been made into scapegoats, leading to repressive anti- immigrant legislation and policies (Massey and Sánchez, 2006). A significant number of jobs have been lost while the conditions of remaining jobs deteriorate and deportations increase. Migrants’ living standards have drastically deteriorated but, contrary to expectations, there have been neither massive return flows nor a collapse in remittances, though there is evidence that migrant worker flows have indeed diminished.

## Environment Impact

### Generic

Attempting to understand the perceived non-human environment through economics inevitably fails and culminates in the destruction of all life

**Weiskel** (Harvard Seminar on Environmental Values) **97**

(Timothy C., 6 July 1997, Selling Pigeons in the Temple: The Danger of Market Metaphors in an Ecosystem, http://ecojustice.net/coffin/ops-008.htm)

The natural order of the world and our role within it is affirmed by market enthusiasts and politicians alike to be an inevitable manifestation of the ongoing logic of an economy of unending, capitalist accumulation. In recent electoral history, politicians took pride in mouthing the simple syllogism, "it's the economy, stupid!" -- as if the only significant role of political leadership was to "grow the economy." Whether we like it or not -- whether we fully know it or not -- this entire worldview is subconsciously enlisted whenever we surrender to the use of market metaphors in devising public policy. It is no wonder that in this framework it is impossible to formulate effective environmental policy to protect biodiversity. Such a worldview arbitrarily restricts the notion of what is possible to what is profitable. Market metaphors truncate the range of policy options open to environmental leaders, and the vocabulary and images these metaphors generate completely fail to capture what we humans value most about our rich and complex world of everyday human experience. The insidious thought control exercised by market metaphors in the public discourse needs to be squarely confronted and firmly rejected. Only by stepping outside the make-believe world of these market metaphors is it possible to see why they mystify rather than clarify our environmental circumstance. Essentially, market metaphors are based on a logical fallacy that projects a fundamental falsification of reality. Despite frequent appeals to the "real world," market advocates live in a self-contained world of abstract modeling, statistical fantasies and paper currency that serves as a proxy measure of wealth. In fact, the real world is quite a different place, consisting of the physical parameters of all life forms that can be measured in terms of meters from sea-level, metric tons of gas emissions and degrees of temperature variation. The human economy needs to be understood as a subset of this physical ecosystem and not the other way around. Environmental policy based on an inverted representation of reality cannot help but fail in the long run. It is for this reason that economism -- the belief that principles of market economics can and should always be used to resolve environmental public policy dilemmas -- represents such a palpable failure of political leadership. Further, the attempt to substitute economism for meaningful public policy constitutes a blatant abdication of the public trust. This tragic abdication of the public trust through the relentless pursuit of economism has fueled the current righteous indignation of global citizens sensitive to the environment and concerned about the prospect of human survival. Politicians under the spell of economism fail to grasp what growing numbers of decent citizens sense and seek to affirm from a very deep level of conviction, and that is simply this: biodiversity must be saved for its intrinsic, expressive, and relational value -- not simply for the momentary advantage it may yield in some economist's cost-benefit calculations. If global policy makers do not free themselves from the trap of market mantras, their claim to leadership will be seen to be vacuous and illegitimate in the long run. This will be so because misplaced market metaphors cannot help but prove fatal in mediating human relationships with the environment. Taken together they have the power to drive industrial civilization into the sad syndrome of "overshoot-and-collapse" so often characteristic of failed economies of accumulation throughout human history. Unless radically different forms of valuation can be rediscovered, unless public leaders can learn to embrace and articulate them, and unless these leaders can then proceed to formulate effective public policy based on these new values to change collective human behavior, we will witness the demise of industrial society as the unavoidable outcome of "business as usual." In short, public leadership needs now to define, declare and defend the public good in terms that transcend private self-interest. There are no doubt connections between the public good and private gain, but to justify the former exclusively in terms of the latter is a fundamental mistake of moral reasoning. Without political leadership that can understand this fundamental difference and learn to defend the public good in its own right, industrial civilization will become irretrievably consumed in a scramble for private profit and personal advantage in a dismal world of diminishing resources. The Secretary General of the United Nations, Kofi Annan, expressed this fear with a rivetting sense of urgency in his opening remarks at the Earth Summit Plus Five conference in New York.(6) Failure to act now could damage our planet irreversibly, unleashing a spiral of increased hunger, deprivation, disease and squalor. Ultimately, we could face the destabilising effects of conflict over vital natural resources....We must not fail.

In past epochs individual religious and spiritual figures emerged to warn society of this kind of impending doom. Prophets of old inveighed against gluttonous consumption based on inequity and iniquity, and they warned societies of the physical consequences of failing to mend their ways. Perhaps more importantly, they served to remind societies of the natural order of the created world and the proper place for humankind within it. Amos, Jesus of Nazareth and Mohammed of Medina all arose in the ancient near east with strikingly parallel messages in this regard. Jews, Christians and Muslims to this day retain scriptural traditions which remind them that the earth does not ultimately belong to humans, nor will their mistreatment of the earth or their fellow creatures go unpunished. In these religious traditions arrogant, self-centered behavior with regard to the created order is thought to be morally wrong, however expedient or profitable it may prove to be for individuals in the short run. We are not fully informed by the preserved text, but one suspects that selling pigeons in the temple prompted a sense of moral indignation on the part of Jesus of Nazareth, not because the prices were a bit too high. Rather such activity inspired moral outrage because selling pigeons in the temple involved a fundamental confusion of the market place with sacred space. It is -- perhaps not surprisingly -- the scientists who speak with the prophetic voice of conviction in our day. Physicists like Nobel Laureate Henry Kendall, the late astronomer Carl Sagan, the evolutionary biologist Edward Wilson and renowned "public" scientists like the late oceanographer Jacques Cousteau now provide us with the clarion call to awareness and action that parallels the prophetic message of old. In a document entitled World Scientists' Warning to Humanity the Union of Concerned Scientists representing more than one hundred Nobel laureates put the message quite plainly:(7) Human beings and the natural world are on a collision course. Human activities inflict harsh and often irreversible damage on the environment and on critical resources. If not checked, many of our current practices put at serious risk the future that we wish for human society and the plant and animal kingdoms, and may so alter the living world that it will be unable to sustain life in the manner that we know. Fundamental changes are urgent if we are to avoid the collision our present course will bring about. It is hard to image a more thorough embodiment of the ancient prophetic tradition. Nevertheless, economists and politicians -- the scribes and Pharisees of our day -- do not yet seem to have understood the point. It is not that their prices are inaccurate -- goodness knows we have some of the world's most clever economists and accountants devoted to the task of assigning nature its cash value. We cannot expect much better on this score. But the issue before us is more fundamental than this. The essential problem is that to approach the issue of biodiversity as if it were an exercise in global bean-counting is fundamentally wrongheaded. It is wrong because it mistakes price for value, proffering market valuations as a proxy surrogate for a meaningful discussion of values. In such a constricted framework there can never be a purposeful debate -- only a mindless, mechanical and endless set of calculations. Given the two-year time frame of the electoral cycle and the pressures to craft policy to please rich and influential interest groups, there are powerful and evident reasons why politicians may well wish to avoid meaningful discussions about values and the environment. In this sense, the alliance between economists and politicians is a marriage of considerable convenience for both partners, but it must be made clear to each of them that this is not acceptable as a mode of public leadership. On this point, scientists and spiritual leaders agree, and it is for this reason that they have joined forces in such impressive numbers to express themselves in terms of the moral obligations facing the human community. The Union of Concerned Scientists has joined with the National Religious Partnership for the Environment to reiterate the prophetic message in churches, temples and mosques across the country and around the world. In a similar vein, research scientists at Harvard have provided strong support for the activities of the Harvard Seminar on Environmental Values convened by the University's Committee on Environment and the Center for the Study of Values in Public Life in order specifically to explore the full range of valuation -- not just economic costs -- which can be drawn upon in developing public policy to protect the environment and biodiversity. The message from spiritual leaders and research scientists alike is as clear as it is forceful: we did not create the world; we cannot control it; we must not destroy it. More precisely: we must not commodify and merchandise biodiversity merely because in the short run it may appear profitable for us to do so. Convinced that we know the price of everything we will soon have lost the ability to value anything that is priceless. The capacity to value some things and human experiences beyond all measure of worldly worth and to esteem them without any thought of their exchange value or sale is surely one of the most cherished attributes that makes us human. To forget this or deny it is to disavow our humanity, and down that road lies our swift and certain extinction**.** The capacity to appreciate intrinsic value is not a quality of humanity that it would be wise to denigrate, dismiss or eliminate in formulating environmental public policy. On the contrary, it may well constitute our last, best hope for survival as a species.

## Inequality/Exn Impact

Neoliberalism creates multiple structural trends towards extinction

Szentes (a Professor Emeritus at the Corvinus University of Budapest) 8

(Tamás, “Globalisation and prospects of the world society”, 4/22 [http://www.eadi.org/fileadmin/Documents/-Events/exco/Glob.\_\_\_prospects\_-\_jav..pdf](http://www.eadi.org/fileadmin/Documents/Events/exco/Glob.___prospects_-_jav..pdf))

It’ s a common place that human society can survive and develop only in a lasting real peace. Without peace countries cannot develop. Although since 1945 there has been no world war, but --numerous local wars took place, --terrorism has spread all over the world, undermining security even in the most developed and powerful countries, --arms race and militarisation have not ended with the collapse of the Soviet bloc, but escalated and continued, extending also to weapons of mass destruction and misusing enormous resources badly needed for development, --many “invisible wars” are suffered by the poor and oppressed people, manifested in mass misery, poverty, unemployment, homelessness, starvation and malnutrition, epidemics and poor health conditions, exploitation and oppression, racial and other discrimination, physical terror, organised injustice, disguised forms of violence, the denial or regular infringement of the democratic rights of citizens, women, youth, ethnic or religious minorities, etc., and last but not least, in the degradation of human environment, which means that --the “war against Nature”, i.e. the disturbance of ecological balance, wasteful management of natural resources, and large-scale pollution of our environment, is still going on, causing also losses and fatal dangers for human life. Behind global terrorism and “invisible wars” we find striking international and intrasociety inequities and distorted development patterns , which tend to generate social as well as international tensions, thus paving the way for unrest and “visible” wars. It is a commonplace now that peace is not merely the absence of war. The prerequisites of a lasting peace between and within societies involve not only - though, of course, necessarily - demilitarisation, but also a systematic and gradual elimination of the roots of violence, of the causes of “invisible wars”, of the structural and institutional bases of large-scale international and intra-society inequalities, exploitation and oppression. Peace requires a process of social and national emancipation, a progressive, democratic transformation of societies and the world bringing about equal rights and opportunities for all people, sovereign participation and mutually advantageous co-operation among nations. It further requires a pluralistic democracy on global level with an appropriate system of proportional representation of the world society, articulation of diverse interests and their peaceful reconciliation, by non-violent conflict management, and thus also a global governance with a really global institutional system. Under the contemporary conditions of accelerating globalisation and deepening global interdependencies in our world, peace is indivisible in both time and space. It cannot exist if reduced to a period only after or before war, and cannot be safeguarded in one part of the world when some others suffer visible or invisible wars. Thus, peace requires, indeed, a new, demilitarised and democratic world order, which can provide equal opportunities for sustainable development. “Sustainability of development” (both on national and world level) is often interpreted as an issue of environmental protection only and reduced to the need for preserving the ecological balance and delivering the next generations not a destroyed Nature with overexhausted resources and polluted environment. However, no ecological balance can be ensured, unless the deep international development gap and intra-society inequalities are substantially reduced. Owing to global interdependencies there may exist hardly any “zero-sum-games”, in which one can gain at the expense of others, but, instead, the “negative-sum-games” tend to predominate, in which everybody must suffer, later or sooner, directly or indirectly, losses. Therefore, the actual question is not about “sustainability of development” but rather about the “sustainability of human life”, i.e. survival of mankind – because of ecological imbalance and globalised terrorism. When Professor Louk de la Rive Box was the president of EADI, one day we had an exchange of views on the state and future of development studies. We agreed that development studies are not any more restricted to the case of underdeveloped countries, as the developed ones (as well as the former “socialist” countries) are also facing development problems, such as those of structural and institutional (and even system-) transformation, requirements of changes in development patterns, and concerns about natural environment. While all these are true, today I would dare say that besides (or even instead of) “development studies” we must speak about and make “survival studies”. While the monetary, financial, and debt crises are cyclical, we live in an almost permanent crisis of the world society, which is multidimensional in nature, involving not only economic but also socio-psychological, behavioural, cultural and political aspects. The narrow-minded, election-oriented, selfish behaviour motivated by thirst for power and wealth, which still characterise the political leadership almost all over the world, paves the way for the final, last catastrophe. One cannot doubt, of course, that great many positive historical changes have also taken place in the world in the last century. Such as decolonisation, transformation of socio-economic systems, democratisation of political life in some former fascist or authoritarian states, institutionalisation of welfare policies in several countries, rise of international organisations and new forums for negotiations, conflict management and cooperation, institutionalisation of international assistance programmes by multilateral agencies, codification of human rights, and rights of sovereignty and democracy also on international level, collapse of the militarised Soviet bloc and system-change3 in the countries concerned, the end of cold war, etc., to mention only a few. Nevertheless, the crisis of the world society has extended and deepened, approaching to a point of bifurcation that necessarily puts an end to the present tendencies, either by the final catastrophe or a common solution. Under the circumstances provided by rapidly progressing science and technological revolutions, human society cannot survive unless such profound intra-society and international inequalities prevailing today are soon eliminated. Like a single spacecraft, the Earth can no longer afford to have a 'crew' divided into two parts: the rich, privileged, wellfed, well-educated, on the one hand, and the poor, deprived, starving, sick and uneducated, on the other. Dangerous 'zero-sum-games' (which mostly prove to be “negative-sum-games”) can hardly be played any more by visible or invisible wars in the world society. Because of global interdependencies, the apparent winner becomes also a loser. The real choice for the world society is between negative- and positive-sum-games: i.e. between, on the one hand, continuation of visible and “invisible wars”, as long as this is possible at all, and, on the other, transformation of the world order by demilitarisation and democratization. No ideological or terminological camouflage can conceal this real dilemma any more, which is to be faced not in the distant future, by the next generations, but in the coming years, because of global terrorism soon having nuclear and other mass destructive weapons, and also due to irreversible changes in natural environment.

## Wars Impact

Neoliberal economic model makes global wars inevitable

**Castles 3**

(Stephen, Towards a Sociology of Forced Migration and Social Transformation, Sociology, Vol. 77, no. 1, pp. 13-34, 2003)

The context of this trend was the inability to achieve economic and social development and the failure to build legitimate and stable states in large areas of the South. What Mary Caldor calls ‘the new wars’ are usually internal wars connected with identity struggles, ethnic divisions, problems of state formation and competition for economic assets. But they are simultaneously transnational as they involve diaspora populations, foreign volunteers and mercenaries, and international intervention forces. They also draw in international journalists, UN aid organizations, NGOs, and regional organizations. The means of warfare have also changed. The protagonists are not large standing armies but irregular forces. The aim is not control of territory, but political control of the population. Mass population expulsion is often a strategic goal, which is why the new wars have led to such an upsurge in forced migration (Kaldor 2001). Ninety per cent of those killed are civilians. Both government forces and insurgents use exemplary violence including torture and sexual assault as means of control. Many politicians and media commentators saw the ethnic cleansing and genocide of Former Yugoslavia, Rwanda etc. as the resurgence of ‘age-old hatreds’. It is more accurate to see such practices as systemic elements of a thoroughly modern new form of warfare (Summerfield 1999). Northern economic interests (such as the trade in oil, diamonds, coltan or small arms) play an important part in starting or prolonging local wars. At a broader level, trade, investment and intellectual property regimes that favour the industrialised countries maintain underdevelopment in the South. Conflict and forced migration are thus ultimately an integral part of the North-South division. This reveals the ambiguity of efforts by the ‘international community’ (which essentially means the powerful Northern states and the intergovernmental agencies) to prevent forced migration. They seek to do this through both entry restrictions in the North and ‘containment’ measures in the South. Containment includes humanitarian aid, peace-keeping missions and even military intervention. At the same time, the North does more to cause forced migration than to stop it, through enforcing an international economic and political order that causes underdevelopment and conflict. However, violence and forced migration also causes social transformation. They destroy economic resources, undermine traditional ways of life and break up communities. Forced migration is thus a factor which deepens underdevelopment, weakens social bonds, and reduces the capacity of communities and societies to achieve positive change. Post-conflict reconstruction rarely leads to restoration of the pre-conflict situation, but rather to new and often problematic social relationships. The study of forced migration therefore should be a central part of the sociology of development. Forced migration is a factor in social transformation in an additional sense, as Mark Duffield has recently argued (Duffield 2001). Persistent underdevelopment in large parts of the South is not an economic problem for the North, because these countries are largely disconnected from the global economy. However, underdevelopment is increasingly seen as a threat to security in the North. This is because the South connects with the North in unexpected and unwanted ways: through the proliferation of transnational informal networks, such as international crime, the drug trade, people smuggling and trafficking, as well as migrant networks which facilitate irregular mobility. Such phenomena are partly a result of trends towards economic deregulation and privatisation in the North, which open up the space for informal economies. The Al Qaida network can be seen as the very epitome of an undesirable transnational network, whose goals and mode of operation would have been unthinkable in any earlier epoch. Duffield argues that the result is a fundamental change in the objectives of both development policy and humanitarianism. Containment of forced migration through neutral humanitarianism has failed. Similarly, the Washington Consensus – the neo-liberal credo of the World Bank and the IMF that underdevelopment could be countered by economic growth based on foreign investments and export-led growth – has proved mistaken. Humanitarianism and development policy have a new joint task: the transformation of whole societies in order to prevent conflict and to achieve social and economic change. The principle of transforming whole societies was contained in a remarkable lecture by the then Senior Vice-President of the World Bank, Joseph Stiglitz, in 1998. He argued that development required fundamental shifts in cultural values and social relationships, and that it was the task of international agencies to help bring these about (Stiglitz 1998). In the meantime, Stiglitz has left the World Bank and been awarded the 2001 Nobel Prize for Economics. Development is now seen by Northern governments and international agencies as impossible without security and peace. This means that humanitarian action and military intervention can no longer attempt to be neutral. Rather, such interventions seek to restore peace at the local level through imposing certain political and economic structures as part of a system of ‘networked global liberal governance**’**. This system has ‘a radical mission to transform societies as a whole, including the attitudes and beliefs of the people within them’ (Duffield 2001). The price of being connected to global economic and political networks is thus the adoption of Northern economic structures, political institutions and value systems.

# \*\*\*Alts\*\*\*

### Movements Alt

Massive networks of oppressed people are coalescing throughout the world now – what they lack is a clear vision to counter neoliberal development.

**Wise** (Director of Doctoral Program in Migration Studies & Prof of Development Studies; Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas, Mexico) **9**

(Raúl Delgado, Forced Migration and US Imperialism: The Dialectic of Migration and Development, Crit Sociol, 35: 767, ProQuest)

The profound need for change in the structural dynamics and strategic practices at work in the current schemes of regional integration and neoliberal national development have given way to two types of social agents, which can be separated into two groups: those ‘from above’ and those ‘from below’. The current economic project has clearly been implemented ‘from above’ by the agents of US imperialism in tandem with Mexican allies. They work within a political coalition that seeks to maintain the privileges of neoliberal integration and push them to its very limits. In short, this is an actual class project that promotes economic asymmetries, social inequalities and phenomena such as poverty, unemployment, labor precarization and migration. In contrast, those ‘below’ – particularly in Mexico – are mostly unhappy and disenchanted, although they sometimes engage in open acts of opposition, resistance, and rebellion. It is true that there is currently no collective agent that can articulate a project that counters the one being implemented by neoliberal elites. However, we should point out that a number of dispersed social alternative movements have willingly, even optimistically, sprung up. The Mexican agricultural sector, one of the quarters that has been hardest hit by the implementation of NAFTA and is suffering in the productive, commercial, population and environmental areas, has given rise to movements like El Barzón (The ‘Plow’), El Campo No Aguanta Más (The Countryside Can’t Take Anymore; see Bartra, 2003) and the campaign Sin Maíz no hay País (No Corn, no Country). Other denouncers of the neoliberal system include the Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional (Zapatista Army of National Liberation, EZLN) and its Otra Campaña (Other Campaign), as well as some sectors of the social and electoral left who have converged into the Coalición por el Bien de Todos (Coalition for the Good of All) and the Convención Nacional Democrática (National Democratic Convention). There are also other more or less important national sociopolitical movements, but what is worth noticing is that the widespread popular discontent (which could even extend to the majority of Mexicans) is not expressed in an organized manner and has not produced yet an alternative development project. On a binational level, the actions of opposition forces have been even more scattered. Initially, the Red Mexicana de Acción frente al Libre Comercio (Mexican Action Network in Opposition of Free Trade) communicated with likeminded organizations in the USA and Canada that opposed the signing of NAFTA, but since then its actions (which involve agreements between unions and social organizations on both sides of the border) have been few and far between (Brooks and Fox, 2004). The idea that migrants are agents of development has been promoted for over a decade. This proposal, which is in no way sustainable when applied to large-scale social processes, suggests that migrants should be held responsible for promoting development in their countries of origin. And yet, as Fox (2005) has pointed out, migrant society has produced social actors who operate on three levels: integration into US society (e.g. unions, the media, and religious organizations); networki ng and promoti on of devel opment i n pl aces of ori gi n (i . e. nati ve organizations), and binational relationships that combine the previous two (i.e. pan-ethnic organizations). For example, Mexican migrant organizations fund public works and social projects in their communities of origin with the aid of the program Tres por Uno. And during the spring of 2006 USA-residing immigrants participated in massive marches in favor of their working, political, social, and civil rights. As for the latter, Petras (2006) points out that ‘between March 25 and May 1, 2006 close to five million migrant workers and their supporters marched through nearly 100 cities of the US’. This, he notes, is the biggest and most sustained workers’ demonstration in the history of the USA. In its 50-year history, the US trade union confederation, the AFL-CIO, has never been capable of mobilizing even a fraction of the workers convoked by the migrant workers movement. The rise and growth of the movement is rooted in the historical experience of the migrant workers (overwhelmingly from Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean), the exploitative and racist experience they confront today in the USA and the future in which they face imprisonment, expulsion and dispossession. Generally speaking, migrants and their organizations affect the political, social, economic, and cultural aspects of sending and receiving countries to varying degrees. However, it would be a theoretical mistake to present migrants themselves as a collective agent of transformation. If we intend to portray them as agents of development, then we had better examine the strategic projects and structural dynamics present on the differ- ent planes and levels, as well as the interests that prompt participation ‘from above’ and ‘from below’. This will allow us to understand the role played by migrants. Stating that they cannot be considered agents of development does not entail a pessimistic message advocating immobility. Quite the opposite: this can help us disentangle possible forms of articulation between migrant organizations and social sectors that seek a new type of development agenda, one that can be applied on the global, regional, national, and local levels. **Only then** will we be able to discuss the configuration of an agent of social trans- formation that includes migrant participation. In any case, as Petras (2006) has pointed out, ‘[t]he emergence of the mass migrant workers’ movement opens a new chapter in the working class struggle both in North America, and Central America’. First and foremost it represents the first major upsurge of independent working class struggle in the USA after over 50 years of decline, stagna- tion and retreat by the established trade union confederation.

### Movements Alt – Knowledge Communities Solvency

New knowledge communities are developing now proves that the alternative is possible

**Wise et al.** (Director of Doctoral Program in Migration Studies & Prof of Development Studies; Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas, Mexico) **10**

(Raúl Delgado Wise, Humberto Márquez Covarrubias, Rubén Puentes, Reframing the debate on migration, development and human rights: fundamental elements, October, 2010, www.migracionydesarrollo.org)

During the later part of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st, the relationship between migration and development has become a major academic and political is- sue encompassing the national, regional and global contexts. So far, the discussion agenda has been dictated by the governments of the major migrant-receiving north- ern countries—primarily the United States and the European Union—and implemented by some key international organizations like the World Bank (WB). These bodies define the topics that determine the course of international and regional forums, policy design, and research financing. The governments of sending and transit countries, mostly located in the southern hemi- sphere as well as parts of Eastern Europe and Central Asia, tend to take a passive stance in the de- bate. Most merely validate the political position taken by receiving countries or discursively protest the treatment received by their emigrants, in order to justify the failure of their own development policies. Some progressive governments, however, are now taking an alternative approach in order to reassess the role played by their nations in the fields of development and migration. Academic research is also under the sway of the dominant agenda, but new voices have begun to question this perspective, highlighting the need to reframe the debate while introduc- ing new theoretical and empirical tools with which to approach these complex problems and find alternative solutions. Some of these new think-tanks include the International Network on Migra- tion and Development (RIMD), the Institutet för Forskning om Migration, Etnicitet och Samhälle (REMESO) in Sweden, Oxford’s International Migration Institute (IMI), Princeton’s Center for Migration and Development (CMD), and the Scalabrini International Migration Network (SIMN). While civil society has not remained passive, its participation in policy making processes has so far been essentially marginal. Organizations, movements and networks that create alternative spaces for discussion and resistance have begun to emerge. Among them is the World Social Forum on Migration, which brings together thousands of delegates each year, including academics. The Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD), a governmental forum derived from the 2006 United Nations (UN) High-Level Dialogue, provides some room for participation and includes spaces where civil society representatives can discuss governmental agendas and make suggestions. Discussions between civil society and governments and northern and southern nations have, how- ever, been unfruitful during the past three GFMD meetings in Brussels, Manila, and Athens. The People’s Global Action on Migration, Development and Human Rights (PGA) has come into being alongside the aforementioned assemblies. It convenes civil society organizations and networks that follow an alternative agenda, seeking to change the terms of the debate and influence public policies. It is worth mentioning that civil society and migrant organizations and networks in particular have driven a wide range of local, regional and transnational development initiatives, in addition to being key participants in regional forums across the globe and weighing in on a wealth of issues. Despite all of this, receiving countries still maintain a reductionist and exclusivist approach to migration and development, obscuring the root causes of the first and ignoring the contribu- tions made by migrants to receiving societies. This discourse also masks the costs migration has for migrants themselves and for their societies of origin, despite the alleged benefits of remittanc- es. Instead of a comprehensive approach, we have a distorted view of reality that encourages the perception of migrants as public enemies. Furthermore, agendas that emphasize national security promote xenophobic, anti-immigration policies. In these circumstances, actual development in countries of origin and respect for migrants’ human rights remain unfulfilled goals.

# \*\*\*Answers To\*\*\*

### A2: Perm

Perm’s inclusion guarantee’s that inequalities are whitewashed and Western interests always win out

**Martell** (University of Sussex, Brighton, UK) **9**

(Luke, Global Inequality, Human Rights and Power: A Critique of Ulrich Beck’s Cosmopolitanism, Critical Sociology 35(2) 253–272, SAGE)

Where Beck does try to put into action his cosmopolitan postcolonialism it runs into trouble (e.g. Beck and Sznaider, 2006). He advocates a ‘both/and’ perspective taking over from an ‘either/or’ perspective. This is good for bringing in previously excluded inputs to views that have stressed Westernization without understanding a mixture of influences including from non-Western sources (e.g. Abu-Lughod, 1989). However a ‘both/and’ view runs the risk of replacing Westernization perspectives with one in which power and inequality is glossed over by an attempt to resurrect understandings of the inputs of non- Western societies. When different global societies meet there are often some that have greater economic, political and ideological power. To highlight this fact is not to endorse it. And it is not to say there are not real sources of opposition and alternatives to Westernization both academically and politically (in the latter case from Iran to Venezuela for example). But positing a ‘both/and’ mix appears to give an equality to a mix of perspectives when there are great inequalities and power differences in that mix. In trying to give more of a role to inputs from beyond the West it runs the risk of playing down the Western power that such inputs are subjected to. Beck’s own use of a ‘both/and’ hybridizing postcolonialism (2000b: 89) underesti- mates these power relations and inequalities. In a discussion of deregulation and flexibi- lization which promote an informal economy, diluted trade union representation and weak states Beck suggests these are non-Western standards being adopted by Western societies. But the direction of power is the other way around. These are structures and effects of neoliberalism being exported by Western-dominated governments and institu- tions to other Western and non-Western societies with the deleterious effects that Beck rightly suggests. Western power is underestimated here when neoliberalism is seen as an effect of the importation of poor regulation from the non-West to West rather than an expression of the corporate and state power of Western interests. So the novelty and uniqueness of Beck’s cosmopolitanism for establishing a postcolo- nial perspective is justified by an understatement of the extent to which postcolonialism is already in existence and an overstatement of the role of cosmopolitanism in having a new role in establishing this itself. At the same time, his more hybrid postcolonial view, rather than restoring a greater emphasis on poorer countries’ contribution to globaliza- tion, may underestimate the power they are subjected to. Beck’s postcolonialism fits into a more general pattern in his work, of underestimating previous cosmopolitanism in social science, overestimating the novelty of his cosmopolitan vision, and leading down a road which rather than overcoming power and inequality seems as much to play down how significant it is.

### A2: No Alt

Rejecting the Aff’s research model makes alternative to neoliberal development possible

**Wise et al.** (Director of Doctoral Program in Migration Studies & Prof of Development Studies; Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas, Mexico) **10**

(Raúl Delgado Wise, Humberto Márquez Covarrubias, Rubén Puentes, Reframing the debate on migration, development and human rights: fundamental elements, October, 2010, www.migracionydesarrollo.org)

The promotion of alternative development as social transformation can prevent forced migration. Ideologically speaking, neoliberal globalization posits itself as inevitable. It is therefore crucial that we theoretically and practically endorse the feasibility of alter- native development strategies. Rejecting the assymetrical power relationships between sending and receiving countries is of paramount importance. This will allow us to identify and counter practices that have plunged vast regions of the world into quagmires of inequality, marginalization, poverty, social exclusion and forced migration. A project of genuine social transformation must focus on the root causes of forced migration and fight them by creating decent, secure, and well-paid employment opportunities. This will make migration an option rather than a necessity.

### A2: Tragedy of the Commons

Commons is the solution not the cause of problems

Mansfield (Professor of Geography @ OSU) 4

(Becky, Geoforum, Neoliberalism in the oceans: “rationalization,” property rights, and the commons question, Volume 35, Issue 3, May 2004, Pages 313–326)

By the 1980s, scholars in anthropology, institutional economics, and geography, among others, were challenging the idea that “the commons” is the ultimate cause of environmental and economic problems associated with resource use. Witnessing the rising popularity of the commons model, not only in fisheries but much more widely after the publication of Hardin's “tragedy of the commons” formulation of the model, scholars began to piece together empirical evidence that countered the argument that resources in the commons are inevitably degraded. Researchers found numerous case studies from around the world, of fisheries and otherwise, in which local people successfully managed common property resources using combinations of explicit and implicit rules and cultural norms to protect resources, control access to those resources, and distribute the benefits of resource use (Berkes, 1989; Bromley, 1992; Burger et al., 2001;Durrenberger and King, 2000; Dyer and McGoodwin, 1994; Hanna and Munasinghe, 1995b; McCay and Acheson, 1987). From this empirical starting point, scholars have offered the commons not as the underlying cause of resource problems, but instead as a potential solution. Community and cooperative management are alternatives in which people's ability to design institutions for resource use and allocation is harnessed to the specific goals of contemporary resource management.6

### A2: Neolib Not Monolithic

Neolib is overdetermined

**Cerny** (Department of Political Science and the Division of Global Affairs, Rutgers University) **9**

(Phillip, Neoliberalisation and Place: Deconstructing and Reconstructing Borders, B. Arts et al. (eds.), The Disoriented State: Shifts in Governmentality, Territoriality and Governance, 13–39, SpringerLink)

Finally, neoliberalisation, I would argue, is overdetermined. The actors and institutions that make up the galaxy of multi-level governance and multi-nodal politics in the 21st century can all be seen as pushing more or less in the same direction, towards more transnationally interconnected political processes as well as market structures. In one sense this means that there is a holistic, ‘fusion’ aspect of the neoliberalisation process that transcends national borders. But it also means that the constellation of variables all play distinct, if complementary, roles in neoliberalisation. In the first place, as argued earlier in this chapter, political actors – politicians and bureaucrats, policy and institutional entrepreneurs, interest groups and even ordinary voters – have in various ways been key actors in this process. For example, state actors today, in pursuing traditional goals of economic growth and development, tend to prioritise using public policy to promote and enhance the international competitiveness of firms and sectors that also play significant roles in the domestic economy – the ‘competition state’ (Cerny 1997, 2000a). In this role they increasingly to construct broad yet neoliberal coalitions such as New Labour in the United Kingdom (Cerny and Evans 2004), the current Christian Democrat-Social Democrat coalition in Germany under Angela Merkel, or even, despite nationalist electoral rhetoric, the quasi-neoliberal majority of Sarkozy in France.

### A2: Things Getting Better

Both real and relative poverty are massively increasing – neoliberal growth is unsustainable

Li (Prof of political economy at the Department of Political Science of York University, fmr. Chinese political prisoner) 4

(Minqi, After Neoliberalism: Empire, Social Democracy, or Socialism?, http://monthlyreview.org/2004/01/01/after-neoliberalism-empire-social-democracy-or-socialism)

According to United Nations’ Human Development Report, the world’s richest 1 percent receive as much income as the poorest 57 percent. The income gap between the richest 20 percent and the poorest 20 percent in the world rose from 30:1 in 1960, to 60:1 in 1990, and to 74:1 in 1999, and is projected to reach 100:1 in 2015. In 1999–2000, 2.8 billion people lived on less than $2 a day, 840 million were undernourished, 2.4 billion did not have access to any form of improved sanitation services, and one in every six children in the world of primary school age were not in school. About 50 percent of the global nonagricultural labor force is estimated to be either unemployed or underemployed.[1](http://monthlyreview.org/2004/01/01/after-neoliberalism-empire-social-democracy-or-socialism#en1)

In many countries, working people have suffered an absolute decline in living standards. In the United States, the real weekly earnings of production and nonsupervisory workers (in 1992 dollars) fell from $315 in 1973 to $264 in 1989. After a decade of economic expansion, it reached $271 in 1999, which remained lower than the average real wage in 1962. In Latin America, a continent that has suffered from neoliberal restructuring since the 1970s, about 200 million people, or 46 percent of the population, live in poverty. Between 1980 and the early 1990s (1991–1994), real wages fell by 14 percent in Argentina, 21 percent in Uruguay, 53 percent in Venezuela, 68 percent in Ecuador, and 73 percent in Bolivia.[2](http://monthlyreview.org/2004/01/01/after-neoliberalism-empire-social-democracy-or-socialism#en2) The advocates of neoliberalism promised that the neoliberal “reforms” or “structural adjustments” would usher in an era of unprecedented economic growth, technological progress, rising living standards, and material prosperity. In fact, the world economy has slowed towards stagnation in the neoliberal era. The average annual growth rate of world GDP declined from 4.9 percent between 1950 and 1973, to 3.0 percent between 1973 and 1992, and to 2.7 percent between 1990 and 2001. Between 1980 and 1998, half of all the “developing countries” (including the so-called “transition economies”) suffered from falling real per capita GDP.[3](http://monthlyreview.org/2004/01/01/after-neoliberalism-empire-social-democracy-or-socialism#en3) The global economy has been kept afloat by the debt-financed U.S. economy. Between 1995 and 2002, the U.S. economy accounted for 96 percent of the cumulative growth in world GDP.[4](http://monthlyreview.org/2004/01/01/after-neoliberalism-empire-social-democracy-or-socialism#en4) The U.S. expansion has been financed by reducing domestic savings, raising the private sector debts to historically unprecedented levels, and running large and ever-rising current account deficits. The process is unsustainable. The enormous imbalances have to be corrected one way or the other. If the United States cannot continue to generate ever-rising current account deficits and none of the other large economies are capable of functioning effectively as the autonomous driving force, the neoliberal global economy will be under powerful downward pressures and exposed to the threat of increasingly frequent and violent financial crises.

### A2: Framework

Beggs the question of the K – We have to adopt a pedagogy that allows revolutionary thought or neoliberal biopower is inevitable

Bourassa (University of Utah Salt Lake City) 11

(GREGORY N. , Rethinking the Curricular Imagination: Curriculum and Biopolitics in the Age of Neoliberalism, 25 JAN 2011, Curriculum Inquiry, Volume 41, Issue 1, pages 5–16, January 2011)

Second, employing the theory of a neoliberal biopolitics of disposability, Giroux highlights the broken promises of public schooling in terms that refocus what is at stake for curriculum inquiry. Beyond the myopic rhetoric of accountability and standards, it is absolute democracy ([Dewey, 1927](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2010.00528.x/full#b15); [Hardt & Negri, 2004](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2010.00528.x/full#b33)) and its unfolding futurity that is in jeopardy. Put differently, a biopolitical reading of curriculum insists that the production and reproduction of certain forms of life are at the very center of the educational experience. Thus, no longer can prevailing conceptions of curriculum fail to locate the ideological underpinnings of school practices, allowing the relationship between schooling and economic, political, and cultural imperatives to remain veiled. In other words, curriculum inquiry must strive to locate and disrupt the commensurability between these prevailing imperatives, their broader political projects and the mandates they impose on curriculum. With the aid of Giroux's biopolitical framework, the curricular imagination must conceive of the educational experience not as a formula to be consumed or constructed for calculable instrumentality, but rather as a vital resource for galvanizing a robust social imagination capable of collectively negotiating and perpetually reconstructing democratic life ([Dewey, 1927](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2010.00528.x/full#b15)). The writings of Tyson Lewis, which I will now turn to, are especially crucial for this task.

Their education is worthless – becomes more neoliberal route learning without a self-reflexive examination of their own assumptions and the possibility of a radical imagining like the alt

Bourassa (University of Utah Salt Lake City) 11

(GREGORY N. , Rethinking the Curricular Imagination: Curriculum and Biopolitics in the Age of Neoliberalism, 25 JAN 2011, Curriculum Inquiry, Volume 41, Issue 1, pages 5–16, January 2011)

One of the more difficult and pressing challenges confronting curriculum inquiry today relates to the increasing enclosure and privatization of the public sphere. Public schools, often exalted and thought to be among the most resilient spaces of the common, are now incredibly fragile, on the brink of being fully besieged by the onslaught of neoliberalism ([De Lissovoy, 2008](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2010.00528.x/full#b12); [Saltman, 2007](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2010.00528.x/full#b48)). While this practice of enclosure is not necessarily new, as market forces have long been encroaching the spaces of public schooling ([Du Bois, 1918](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2010.00528.x/full#b17); [Dewey, 1930](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2010.00528.x/full#b16)), the emergence of neoliberalism in the last thirty years marks a particularly insidious turn. The novelty of neoliberalism resides not only in that it has become normalized and even celebrated, but also in that the far-reaching tentacles of neoliberalism assume pedagogical dimensions.[1](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2010.00528.x/full#en1) At the same time, the unapologetic posturing of neoliberalism ([Giroux, 2009](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2010.00528.x/full#b27)) offers curriculum theorists the contours of a common target that has not always been so easily recognizable in attempts to chart the flows and logics of capital. From this, we might gather that the current configuration of neoliberalism, like that of public schooling, precariously occupies a liminal status between that of inordinate durability and immanent vulnerability. Given the hubris and arrogance of neoliberalism, we are now better armored with the vocabularies and conceptual understandings needed to both defend and rethink the institution of public schooling in our current juncture. For curriculum inquiry, this means reclaiming, and more accurately, reinventing, the educational experience. As [William Pinar (2004](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2010.00528.x/full#b45)) notes: In its interest in and commitment to the study of educational experience, curriculum theory is critical of contemporary school “reform.” Indeed, “educational experience” seems precisely what politicians do not want, as they insist we focus on test scores, the “bottom line.” By linking the curriculum to student performance on standardized examinations, politicians have, in effect, taken control of what is to be taught: the curriculum. Examination-driven curricula demote teachers from scholars and intellectuals to technicians in service to the state. The cultivation of self-reflexive, interdisciplinary erudition and intellectuality disappears. Rationalized as “accountability,” political socialization replaces education. (pp. 2–3) Although Pinar is highlighting some of the most saliently corrosive school practices, his stress on the enclosure of the educational experience does not translate into acquiescence to market forces. In fact, it could be argued that the circumstances for absolute democracy have never been more possible ([Hardt & Negri, 2004](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2010.00528.x/full#b33)).[2](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2010.00528.x/full#en2) In the face of perpetual reform, high-stakes testing, mechanical pedagogy, scripted curricula, and punitive disciplinary practices, curriculum inquiry is immediately thrust into a limit-situation in which a new horizon of possibilities is unveiled ([Freire, 2000](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2010.00528.x/full#b22)). In other words, these realities are not “the impassable boundaries where possibilities end, but the real boundaries where all possibilities begin” (Alvaro Vieira Pinto, quoted in [Freire, 2000](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2010.00528.x/full#b22), p. 99). With this, the task of curriculum inquiry is to collectively imagine fields of possibility ([Appadurai, 1996](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2010.00528.x/full#b3)), working from the occupied, yet generative, confines of a “cramped space” ([Deleuze & Guattari, 1986](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2010.00528.x/full#b13), p. 17). At the same time, such calls for an unleashed curricular imagination must be tempered with the humility of a diligent yet playful social imagination that recognizes that problems are always beginning anew and altering in both form and appearance ([de Certeau, 1984](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2010.00528.x/full#b11)). Thus in curriculum inquiry's quest to reinvent public schooling as a beacon of possibility and promise for a new democratic future, the only way to proceed is to nourish a radically collective imagination and embrace the inextinguishable spirit of struggle ([Dewey, 1927](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2010.00528.x/full#b15); [Giroux, Penna, & Pinar, 1981](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2010.00528.x/full#b29); [Pinar, 2004](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2010.00528.x/full#b45)).

# \*\*\*Affirmative Answers\*\*\*

## 2AC-Frontline

### 2AC-Perm

Perm Do both-Perm solves--Green investment now is crucial in the short term – starting now is key to avoid extinction from warming

Schwartzman (Professor in the Department of Biology at Howard University, PhD in Geochemistry from Brown University) 11

(David, Green New Deal: An Ecosocialist Perspective, Capitalism Nature Socialism, [Volume 22](http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rcns20?open=22#vol_22), [Issue 3](http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/rcns20/22/3), 18 Aug, pages 49-56)

Indeed, imposing such non-market limits is imperative, but the struggle to impose them must begin in capitalist societies now, and not be posed simply as the policies of future socialism. Yes, aggressive energy conservation is imperative, especially in the United States and other countries of the global North. We can all live better with a sharp reduction of wasteful consumption, breathe clean air, drink clean water, and eat organic food. Nevertheless, there needs to be a global increase in the power capacity, employing clean energy and not fossil fuels or nuclear power, to insure every child born on this planet has the material requirements for the highest quality of life (Schwartzman and Schwartzman [2011](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10455752.2011.593886#CIT0010)). But should we anticipate that Green Capitalism, even pushed to its limits by class struggle, could indefinitely postpone the final demise of global capitalism and could actually replace the present unsustainable energy base with a renewable power infrastructure fast enough to avoid catastrophic climate change (C3)? I submit this prospect is highly unlikely. The legacy and political economy of real existing capitalism alone makes *global* solar capitalism a delusion (Schwartzman[2009](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10455752.2011.593886#CIT0008)). While the Pentagon pretends to go “green,” it remains the servant of the imperial system protecting fossil fuel and strategic metals flowing into the MIC, the Military Industrial (Fossil Fuel, Nuclear, State Terror) Complex. The immense power of the MIC is the biggest obstacle to implementing an effective prevention program that has a plausible chance of avoiding C3. The avoidance of C3 requires an end to coal and fossil fuel addiction, giving up the nuclear option, and a rapid conversion to a high-efficiency solar energy infrastructure. *To summarize, the MIC is at present the biggest single obstacle to preventing C3 because:* It is the present core of global capital reproduction with its colossal waste of energy and material resources. The fossil fuel and nuclear industries are integrated within the MIC. The MIC has a dominant role in setting the domestic and foreign policy agenda of the United States and other leading capitalist countries. The Pentagon is the “global oil-protection service” for both the U.S. imperial agenda (Klare [2007](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10455752.2011.593886#CIT0005)) and the transnational capital class itself (e.g., Robinson [2004](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10455752.2011.593886#CIT0007)). The MIC's Imperial Agenda blocks the global cooperation and equity required to prevent C3. Nevertheless, what the struggle for a GND [Green New Deal] can accomplish is very significant, indeed critical to confronting the challenge of preventing C3 [Catastrophic Climate Change]. *Humanity cannot afford to wait for socialism to replace capitalism to begin implementing this prevention program* [Italics Original]*.* And I have argued that starting this prevention program under existing capitalism can open up a path toward ecosocialist transition, indeed a 21st century Socialism worthy of its name. Climate science tells us we must proceed now for any plausible chance of avoiding tipping points plunging us into C3. Green job creation is likewise the creation of a new working-class sector committed to ending the fossil fuel addiction. Such an historic shift to renewable energy supplies would be comparable to the industrial revolution that replaced plant power in the form of wood and agricultural products with coal.

### 2AC-Alt Can’t Solve Warming

Short timeframe for action means quick policy solutions are key – otherwise runaway warming will cause extinction and prevent radical changes to society [Revolution? Ain’t nobody got time for that]

Parenti 13

(Christian, “A Radical Approach to the Climate Crisis” [http://www.dissentmagazine.org/article/a-radical-approach-to-the-climate-crisis] Summer //mtc)

Several strands of green thinking maintain that capitalism is incapable of a sustainable relationship with non-human nature because, as an economic system, capitalism has a growth imperative while the earth is finite. One finds versions of this argument in the literature of eco-socialism, deep ecology, eco-anarchism, and even among many mainstream greens who, though typically declining to actually name the economic system, are fixated on the dangers of “growth.”¶ All this may be true. Capitalism, a system in which privately owned firms must continuously out-produce and out-sell their competitors, may be incapable of accommodating itself to the limits of the natural world. However, that is not the same question as whether capitalism can solve the more immediate climate crisis.¶ Because of its magnitude, the climate crisis can appear as the sum total of all environmental problems—deforestation, over-fishing, freshwater depletion, soil erosion, loss of biodiversity, chemical contamination. But halting greenhouse gas emissions is a much more specific problem, the most pressing subset of the larger apocalyptic panorama.¶ And the very bad news is, time has run out. As I write this, news arrives of an ice-free arctic summer by 2050. Scientists once assumed that would not happen for hundreds of years.¶ Dealing with climate change by first achieving radical social transformation—be it a socialist or anarchist or deep-ecological/neo-primitive revolution, or a nostalgia-based localista conversion back to a mythical small-town capitalism—would be a very long and drawn-out, maybe even multigenerational, struggle. It would be marked by years of mass education and organizing of a scale and intensity not seen in most core capitalist states since the 1960s or even the 1930s.¶ Nor is there any guarantee that the new system would not also degrade the soil, lay waste to the forests, despoil bodies of water, and find itself still addicted to coal and oil. Look at the history of “actually existing socialism” before its collapse in 1991. To put it mildly, the economy was not at peace with nature. Or consider the vexing complexities facing the left social democracies of Latin America. Bolivia, and Ecuador, states run by socialists who are beholden to very powerful, autonomous grassroots movements, are still very dependent on petroleum revenue.¶ A more radical approach to the crisis of climate change begins not with a long-term vision of an alternate society but with an honest engagement with the very compressed timeframe that current climate science implies. In the age of climate change, these are the real parameters of politics.¶ Hard Facts¶ The scientific consensus, expressed in peer-reviewed and professionally vetted and published scientific literature, runs as follows: For the last 650,000 years atmospheric levels of CO2—the primary heat-trapping gas—have hovered at around 280 parts per million (ppm). At no point in the preindustrial era did CO2 concentrations go above 300 ppm. By 1959, they had reached 316 ppm and are now over 400 ppm. And the rate of emissions is accelerating. Since 2000, the world has pumped almost 100 billion tons of carbon into the atmosphere—about a quarter of all CO2 emissions since 1750. At current rates, CO2 levels will double by mid-century.¶ Climate scientists believe that any increase in average global temperatures beyond 2 degrees Celsius above preindustrial levels will lead to dangerous climate change, causing large-scale desertification, crop failure, inundation of coastal cities, mass migration to higher and cooler ground, widespread extinctions of flora and fauna, proliferating disease, and possible social collapse. Furthermore, scientists now understand that the earth’s climate system has not evolved in a smooth linear fashion. Paleoclimatology has uncovered evidence of sudden shifts in the earth’s climate regimes. Ice ages have stopped and started not in a matter of centuries, but decades. Sea levels (which are actually uneven across the globe) have risen and fallen more rapidly than was once believed.¶ Throughout the climate system, there exist dangerous positive-feedback loops and tipping points. A positive-feedback loop is a dynamic in which effects compound, accelerate, or amplify the original cause. Tipping points in the climate system reflect the fact that causes can build up while effects lag. Then, when the effects kick in, they do so all at once, causing the relatively sudden shift from one climate regime to another.¶ Thus, the UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change says rich countries like the United States must cut emissions 25 percent to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2020—only seven years away—and thereafter make precipitous cuts to 90 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. This would require global targets of 10 percent reductions in emissions per annum, starting now. Those sorts of emissions reductions have only occurred during economic depressions. Russia’s near total economic collapse in the early 1990s saw a 37 percent decrease in CO2 emissions from 1990 to 1995, under conditions that nobody wants to experience. ¶ The political implications of all this are mind-bending. As daunting as it may sound, it means that it is this society and these institutions that must cut emissions. That means, in the short-term, realistic climate politics are reformist politics, even if they are conceived of as part of a longer-term anti-capitalist project of totally economic re-organization.¶ Dreaming the Rational¶ Of course, successful reformism often involves radical means and revolutionary demands. What other sort of political pressure would force the transnational ruling classes to see the scientific truth of the situation? But let us assume for a second that political elites faced enough pressure to force them to act. What would be the rational first steps to stave off climate chaos?¶

And only a pro-economic framing is able to motivate people for change

Jost et al. (Dept of Psychology at NYU) 10

(Irina Feygina, John T. Jost, and Rachel E. Goldsmith, System Justification, the Denial of Global Warming, and the Possibility of “System- Sanctioned Change”, Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin 36(3) 326 –338, SAGE)

Our third and final study provides encouraging evidence that system justification tendencies need not hinder the formation of pro-environmental intentions and behaviors. To the extent that we can encourage people to perceive environmentalism as a way of upholding (rather than threatening) cherished societal institutions and practices, it may be possible to transform resistance and inaction into constructive engagement. The key, it seems, is to characterize pro-environmental change as “system sanctioned,” that is, as a desired, perhaps necessary, means of preserving the American way of life, and to com- municate that it is, among other things, patriotic to defend and protect natural resources. Under such circumstances, it is conceivable that many more citizens (including more of those who are presently skeptical) will embrace and begin to justify a new, more environmentally sound regime. Along these lines, Kay et al. (2002) found that people engage in anticipatory rationalization of the status quo so that as the perceived likelihood of an event increases, it is judged to be increasingly desirable. This aspect of system justification motivation may well give rise to stronger support for change in the face of pro-environmental legislation and economic initiatives, once they are perceived to be inevitable. The communication of information about environmental problems leaves much room for interpretational ambiguity, partly because of the novelty and complexity of the issues. Although this ambiguity has often contributed to confusion and misinterpretation, our findings suggest that it can also be used constructively. The philosophy that assumes an inher- ent opposition between the well-being of our social and especially economic systems and the natural environment is deeply flawed, at least in terms of its behavioral conse- quences. Our research suggests that people may be more open to pro-environmental initiatives than is commonly assumed. If including a brief message suggesting that envi- ronmentalism is patriotic and helps preserve our way of life can eliminate the negative effect of system justification, there is reason to hope that a more concerted campaign can succeed in creating the perception that caring about one’s country (and its socioeconomic institutions) is compatible with a concern for the natural world.

2AC Alt Can’t Solve Capitalism

Alt fails – movements too small, elite backlash, no material interests

Gordon (PhD from Oxford, teaches environmental politics and ethics at the Arava Institute for Environmental Studies) 12

(Uri, Anarchist Economics in Practice in The Accumulation of Freedom, pg. 215)

On the one hand, the anarchist movement is so small that even its most consistent and visible efforts are but a drop in the ocean. On the other hand, political elites have proven themselves extremely proficient at pulling the ground from under movements for social change, be it through direct repression and demonization of the activists, diversion of public attention to security and nationalist agendas, or, at best, minimal concessions that ameliorate the most exploitative aspects of capitalism while contributing to the resilience of the system as a whole. It would seem that ethical commitments to social justice and the enhancement of human freedom can only serve as a motivation for a comparatively small number of people, and that without the presence of genuine material interests among large sections of the population there is little hope for a mass movement to emerge that would herald the departure from existing social, economic, and political arrangements.

### 2AC-Alt Fails – Cap Inevitable

Their alternative is hopeless utopianism – human nature.

Hunter 11 [Mark Hunter is Professor of Humanities at St. Petersburg College. June 21, 2011 To Attack Capitalism Is To Attack Human Nature http://www.realclearmarkets.com/articles/2011/06/21/to\_attack\_capitalism\_is\_to\_attack\_human\_nature\_99087.html]

McCarraher's denunciation of capitalism is in fact an attack on human nature disguised as political discourse. The "pernicious" traits he attributes to capitalism are, in fact, traits globally present in every political/social order-in many cases far worse in non-capitalistic societies-because they are traits of humanity itself. His entire argument against capitalism consists of nothing more than an elaborate correlation-proves-causation fallacy (cum hoc ergo propter hoc - "with this, therefore because of this"). He wants us to believe that since capitalism contains greed it causes greed. Furthermore, McCarraher seems content to overlook the fact that capitalism is an organic economic system not created as much as evolving naturally as a consequence of free individuals interacting with other free individuals. Private property and the production of goods may be a part of capitalism, but its most essential virtue is as a guardian of man's freedom. Criticizing capitalism for its avarice is not unlike condemning representative democracy for its failure to elect the wisest of men - each may occur, but it is not relevant to their fundamental purpose. Both capitalism and representative democracy maximize freedom by diffusing power and responsibility across the broadest spectrum of society. Rigid control is antithetical to freedom and it is this that most vexes the liberal intellectual. What McCarraher is unwilling to come to terms with is that his inherent criticism of capitalism is not so much an indictment of capitalism but rather a revealing supposition he is making about humanity itself. His attack on capitalism masks a general contempt for a free people who in his worldview will inevitably choose a path of greed and avarice unless a coercive political order prevents it. Therefore, any liberal political/economic system proposed to replace capitalism must have at its core a process through which the masses are controlled and coerced to overcome the human attributes so abhorred by the liberal intellectual that he wrongly attributes to capitalism rather than people. McCarraher presents the reader with a moral crusade cleverly cloaked as political theory. He sees the Deadly Sins ever present in modern capitalism, and like the fourth century ascetic Evagrius Ponticus, McCarraher seems particularly obsessed with man's rapacious gluttony. While capitalism's natural and organic nature is condemned for its "deliberate nurturance of our vilest qualities" he fails to put forth the ramifications of the artificial and contrived alternative. The progressive alternative to capitalism must of necessity resemble Dostoyevsky's Grand Inquisitor because the crux of the matter for both modern liberals and Dostoyevsky is human freedom. The infinite variety that is millions of people making millions of decisions to reflect their own self interest needs to be replaced with a 21st century Ubermensch or new political aristocracy that is able to impose on the masses a sin-free, enlightened order. Redemption comes through man's inability to choose the indulgence of sin, and as such the anointed elite - having removed man's freedom - become the deliverers of man's salvation by taking upon themselves the burden of choice. Mankind, now being absolved of the burden of freedom, can live content without the anxiety of responsibility. However beautiful the veneer of his lofty rhetoric, this "Wellspring" is in the end enslavement. The only way to deliver mankind from the demon Mammon will be by removing the greatest gift of the gods - freedom. In this Faustian exchange we are guaranteed the Marxist security of bread, authoritarian certainty of order and utopian unity of world government. Far from new, McCarraher's Wellspring of Radical Hope is one more self-righteous proclamation by a moral prig intent on delivering mankind to elusive Olympian heights. Beyond the rhetoric, one suspects this experiment would end as other such utopian pursuits have concluded in history - hopeless.

### 2AC- Transition Fails

Letting the system collapse on its own causes extinction – only struggle within the capitalism can end the system

Schwartzman (Professor in the Department of Biology at Howard University, PhD in Geochemistry from Brown University) 11

(David, Green New Deal: An Ecosocialist Perspective, Capitalism Nature Socialism, [Volume 22](http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rcns20?open=22#vol_22), [Issue 3](http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/rcns20/22/3), 18 Aug, pages 49-56)

And unlike the New Deal, achieving the GND on a global scale in the context of a robust solar transition, by necessityaccompanied by demilitarization, will not end with a reinforcement of militarized capital, as was the case in WWII and the Cold War aftermath. Rather, the GND has real potential for opening up a path out of capitalism into ecosocialism. WWII and the emergence of the MIC postponed the terminal crisis of capitalism to this century. Now we face the welcome project of taking that terminal crisis on and finishing the job.

We need a strategy of transition. This should be a priority in theory and practice for ecosocialists. Any Left worth its label and demonization by Glenn Beck and company must not only confront the immediate needs of the great majority of those exploited and oppressed by big capital, but also be a leader in organizing to fight back. So jobs, affordable housing, health and child care, environmental quality, and environmental justice must be on the left agenda. But what kind of jobs? For unsustainable or sustainable green production? And what about the conditions for the reproduction of labor power, itself a site of multi-dimensional class struggle, as Michael [Lebowitz](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10455752.2011.593886#CIT0006) has argued (2003). Thus, the fightback program must confront the ecological crisis and demand solutions that address climate change by embracing clean energy.

We should never advocate or even think that the “worse the better” will deliver socialism by the collapse of capitalism, anticipating its terminal illness as hope. For capitalism's dead weight will kill us all. No slogan or propaganda alone can achieve success, as important as this ideological struggle is. Rather, only multidimensional and local-to-transnational class struggle within capitalism (see [Abramsky](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10455752.2011.593886#CIT0001)'s illuminating volume 2010) can terminate this system, which unfortunately will not die a natural death on its own accord. It will have to be put to sleep forever. A critical role of the ecosocialist Left is to identify the strategic class sectors—those existing and those in formation—that will be the gravediggers of capitalism. Additionally, the ecosocialist Left must also, of course, participate in the creation of a collective vision and its realization as embryos within capitalism of the new global civilization ending the rule of capital.

We now witness or can soon anticipate ongoing struggles for social governance of production and consumption on all scales from neighborhood to global. Areas of struggle in this fight should include nationalization of the energy, rail, and telecommunications industries; municipalization of electric and water supplies; the creation and maintenance of decentralized solar power, food, energy and farming cooperatives; the encouragement of worker-owned factories (solidarity economy), the replacement of industrial and GMO agriculture with agroecologies; the creation of green cities; and of course organizing the unorganized in all sectors, especially GND workers. All of these objectives should be part of the ecosocialist agenda for struggles around a GND, which of course, must include the termination of the MIC. One outstanding example of how to begin is found in Mike Davis [2010](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10455752.2011.593886#CIT0003)), who argues for the potential of a radical movement for green urbanism (see my commentary, [Schwartzman](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10455752.2011.593886#CIT0009), 2008).

## 1AR

### 1AR-Alt Fails – Rejection Fails

Alt doesn’t solve cap

Gordon (PhD from Oxford, teaches environmental politics and ethics at the Arava Institute for Environmental Studies) 12

(Uri, Anarchist Economics in Practice in The Accumulation of Freedom, pg. 205-7)

Withdrawal

Perhaps better defined as a "non‑practice" than as a practice, the term "withdrawal" here indicates the various ways in which anarchists may abstain from participation in central institutions of the capitalist economy‑primarily the wage system and the consumption of purchased goods. The goal of such a strategy is to weaken capitalism by sapping its energy, reducing its inputs in terms of both human labor and cultural legitimation. To be sure, the ubiquity of capitalist relations means that the options for withdrawal remain partial at best. Most of us must work for someone else to survive, and buy necessities that are not otherwise available for acquisition. Nevertheless, there are ways in which participation in capitalism can be significantly reduced, or undertaken on its qualitatively different margins. Rather than seeking full employment and aspiring to a lifelong career, anarchists can choose to work part‑time or itinerantly, earning enough to supply their basic needs but not dedicating more time to waged work than is absolutely necessary‑perhaps on the way towards the abolition of work as compulsory, alienated production.3 In the area of housing, squatting a living space rather than renting one also abstains from participation in capitalism, though this option is less sustainable in most countfies since it will almost certainly end in eviction. Anarchists may also reduce their participation in the moneyed circulation of commodities by reusing and recycling durable goods, and by scavenging or growing some of their own food rather than purchasing it from the supermarket. 4 Such practices can never by themselves destroy capitalism, since in the final analysis they remain confined to the level of personal lifestyle and rely on capitalism’s continued existence in order to inhabit its margins and consume its surpluses. Nevertheless, strategies of withdrawal do complement other practices in carving out a separate space from capitalism, as well as in expressing a rejection of its ideologies of dedication to the workplace and of consumption as the road to happiness.

Alt fails and leads to ressetiment

Connolly 11

(William E., A World of Becoming, Duke University Press)

But such cinematic labors of the negative are not sufficient; they certainly do not suffice to promote positive attachment to this world. Even a "negative dialectic" does not suffice. If things are left there, the embers of ressentiment can easily become more inflamed. That is one reason Deleuze is never happy with negative critique alone: the next task is to highlight how our participation in a world of real creativity that also finds expression elsewhere in the universe depends on and draws from such fugitive interruptions. To put it too starkly (for situational nuances and adjustments are pertinent here), the more people who experience a positive connection between modes of interruption and the possibility of our modest participation as individuals, constituencies, states, and a species in creative processes extending beyond us, the more apt we are to embrace the new temporal experiences around us as valuable parts of existence as such. Certainly, absent a world catastrophe or a repressive revolution that would create worse havoc than the conditions it seeks to roll back, these consummate features of late‑modem life are not apt to dissipate soon. The fastest zones of late‑modem life, for instance, are not apt to slow down in the absence of a catastrophe that transforms everything. So the radical task is to find ways to strengthen the connection between the fundamental terms of late‑modem existence and positive attachment to life as such. This should be accomplished not by embracing exploitation and suffering, but by challenging them as we come to terms with the larger trends.

Progressive change is possible and effective – the alt fails and leads to authoritarianism

Connolly 11

(William E., A World of Becoming, Duke University Press)

Is it not obligatory to expose and resist the system as such rather than taking cumulative actions to move it? Don't such actions necessarily fold back in on themselves, feeding the dosed system they seek to move? Some theorists on the Left say such things, but they themselves have too dosed a view of the systems they criticize. No system in a world of becoming composed of multiple, interacting systems of different types, with different capacities of self‑organization, is entirely dosed. It is both more vulnerable to the outside than the carriers of hubris imagine and periodically susceptible to creative movement from within and without simultaneously. Moreover, pure negativity on the Left does not sustain either critique or militancy for long, but rather, it tends eventually to lapse into resignation or to slide toward the authoritarian practices of the Right that already express with glee the moods of negativity, hubris, or existential revenge. We have witnessed numerous examples of such disappointing transitions in the last several decades, when a negative or authoritarian mood is retained while the creed in which it was set is changed dramatically. We must therefore work on mood, belief; desire, and action together. As we do so we also amplify positive attachment to existence itself amidst the specific political resentments that help to spur us on. To ignore the existential dimension of politics is to increase the risks of converting a noble movement into an authoritarian one and to amplify the power of bellicose movements that mobilize destructive potential. To focus on the negative dimension alone is to abjure the responsibilities of political action during a dangerous time.

To review, none of the role interventions listed above nor all in concert could suffice to break such a global resonance machine. Luck and pregnant points of contact with salutary changes in state actions, other cross‑state citizen movements, the policies of international organizations, creative market innovations, and religious organization are needed. But those larger constellations may not themselves move far in a positive direction unless they meet multiple constituencies primed to join them and geared to press them whenever they lapse into inertia, if a world resonance machine of revenge and counter‑revenge stretches, twists, and constrains the classical image of sovereign units, regionally anchored creeds, uneven capitalist exchange, and international organizations, while drawing selective sustenance from all of them, a new counter‑machine must do so too.

### 1AR-Alt Fails – Capitalism inevitable

Cap isn’t collapsing now – the economic and environmental crisis are not sufficient to dislodge the system

Castree (School of Environment and Development, Manchester University) 10

(N., Crisis, Continuity and Change: Neoliberalism, the Left and the Future of Capitalism. Antipode, 41: 185–213)

To my mind, the Left should not get its hopes up—at least not yet. It's sad to say, but only the most wild-eyed optimist could believe that the two perceived crises of our time are harbingers of a better future. Taking two cases—one national scale, one international—I want to argue that Gramsci was right. The “old” may be dying, but it's far from dead. The essay comprises four parts. I begin in the heat of the moment, by describing how and why the idea of two concurrent worldwide “crises” became commonplace in a surprisingly short space of time (2007–2009). Following this, I take a theoretical detour intended to explain why these crises have arisen, and how they might play out. Marx, Karl Polanyi and James O’Connor are my guides. Focusing on Britain as an illustrative case, I then explain why the present moment is not, regrettably, a propitious one for left-wing change-makers. My point is to show that even in neoliberalism's heartlands, in the thick of a financial crisis, there is only weak impetus for change. After this examination of how crisis is playing-out at the scale of one notable nation state, I delve into the world of international emissions trading philosophy and practice—with a particular focus on the European Union's still young scheme. I suggest that the myriad practical failures of this and other market approaches to greenhouse gas mitigation belie the abstract logic of “free market environmentalism”. Even so, these approaches will be with us for many years to come in all probability. A short conclusion looks to a future hopefully free of those “morbid symptoms” that Gramsci described just after the Great Crash of 1929. It's a future that will, I fear, be very hard to make. If William James were writing today, he probably would not bet on the Left making its ideals flesh any time soon. Not for the first time, some optimism of the will is required—quite a lot, in fact.

### 1AR-Perm Solves – Transition/Warming

Must work within the market in order to solve warming and transition wars

Lewis and Canaty (executive director of the Center for Community Enterprise; honorary research fellow at the University of Birmingham and a director of Common Futures) 12

(Michael and Patrick, The Resilience Imperative: Cooperative Transitions to a Steady-state Economy, New Society Publishers, googlebooks)

The agenda of the Great Transition also encompasses three major dimensions of change. Think of them as the 3 Ps: the personal, practical, and political. Simplistic silver‑bullet solutions, and sound bites spun for culturally stunted attention spans, will not do. Consciously acting to link up the three Ps with a multi‑level agenda guided by the resilience imperative and cooperative transitions is complex. Balkanized movements cannot contend with the scale of the problems and challenges we face, nor the powerful forces that must be resisted and restrained. All kinds of constituencies must be engaged unions, regionally based small and medium‑sized businesses, all manner of community and cooperative enterprises and intermediaries, farmers, credit unions and progressive financial institutions, arts and culture organizations, faith organizations, environmental groups, politicians, and academics. We can also work with large companies, though caution and principled shrewdness is necessary. Companies occupying the low‑road/high‑carbon economy have too much power, are unaccountable, and are so addicted to the capitalist logic of growth that they represent a real and present danger to all of us. However, there are other companies that are committed to building a highroad/low‑carbon economy, and we need their know‑how and partnership if we are to navigate the Great Transition without violence**.** So there we have it we are challenged to work consciously from local to global across sectors, engage creatively multiple constituencies, while all the while paying attention simultaneously to the macro and micro features of the transition challenge. Isn't life interesting? We have been acutely conscious, while writing this book, that our concentration has been on the micro side of the transition challenge, though we have attempted to keep the macro side consciously in play as a kind of counterpoint tension. We hope we have shown how crucial change at the macro policy and systems level is for facilitating and easing transition to a low‑carbon, more democratic, and fair economy. Indeed, there are a number of key policy questions that we have raised directly or indicated in passing. These evident and practical possibilities can be summarized as: 100 percent debt‑free money: Why not mov e step by step toward governments issuing democratic currency free of interest and, indeed, removing from banks the power to freely issue money as high‑cost debt?

### 1AR-Perm solves-State Key

Development of an effective civil society is key to fighting the worst effects of neoliberalism

Wise et al. (Director of Doctoral Program in Migration Studies & Prof of Development Studies; Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas, Mexico) 10

(Raúl Delgado Wise, Humberto Márquez Covarrubias, Rubén Puentes, Reframing the debate on migration, development and human rights: fundamental elements, October, 2010, www.migracionydesarrollo.org)

An agent of social transformation. An alternative agenda also requires the articulation of a collective agent that enables the strategic participation of a broad diversity of civil society sectors in processes of social transformation (Gordon, 2009; Fox, 2005; Munck, 2010; Milkman, 2006). Unlike what neoliberal doctrine posits, the active participation of the state in crucial to the promotion of development and the creation of support institutions, including those that regulate domestic and foreign investment and promote social welfare. An organized civil society must act as guardian and guarantor of the development process as a whole.

## Capitalism Good

### Capitalism Good – Poverty and Structural Violence

Both poverty and war deaths are at their lowest levels because of US-led globalization

Barnett, Professor in the Warfare Analysis & Research Department, U.S. Naval War College, 11

(Thomas P.M.,“The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S., and Globalization, at Crossroads,” March 7 <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/8099/the-new-rules-leadership-fatigue-puts-u-s-and-globalization-at-crossroads>,)

It is worth first examining the larger picture: We live in a time of arguably the greatest structural change in the global order yet endured, with this historical moment's most amazing feature being its relative and absolute lack of mass violence. That is something to consider when Americans contemplate military intervention in Libya, because if we do take the step to prevent larger-scale killing by engaging in some killing of our own, we will not be adding to some fantastically imagined global death count stemming from the ongoing "megalomania" and "evil" of American "empire." We'll be engaging in the same sort of system-administering activity that has marked our stunningly successful stewardship of global order since World War II. Let me be more blunt: As the guardian of globalization, the U.S. military has been the greatest force for peace the world has ever known. Had America been removed from the global dynamics that governed the 20th century, the mass murder never would have ended. Indeed, it's entirely conceivable there would now be no identifiable human civilization left, once nuclear weapons entered the killing equation. But the world did not keep sliding down that path of perpetual war. Instead, America stepped up and changed everything by ushering in our now-perpetual great-power peace. We introduced the international liberal trade order known as globalization and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. What resulted was the collapse of empires, an explosion of democracy, the persistent spread of human rights, the liberation of women, the doubling of life expectancy, a roughly 10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP and a profound and persistent reduction in battle deaths from state-based conflicts. That is what American "hubris" actually delivered.

Neoliberalism is causing a massive drop in absolute poverty

Obhof, Graduate of Yale Law School, 2003

(“WHY GLOBALIZATION? A LOOK AT GLOBAL CAPITALISM AND ITS EFFECTS”. University of Florida Journal of Law & Public Policy. Fall 2003)

The effects of globalization have largely been positive for both developed and developing countries. Consider, for example, the effects of the Uruguay Round of trade negotiations, which lasted from 1986 to 1994 and resulted in agreements to reduce tariffs and other non-tariff barriers. Advanced countries agreed to lower their tariffs by an average of 40%, and [\*99] the signatories agreed to liberalize trade in the important areas of agriculture and clothing. n32 The effects of the Uruguay Round have been both positive and large. Reducing tariffs and non-tariff barriers has produced annual increases in global GDP of $ 100-300 billion. n33 This figure is five times larger than the total worldwide aid to developing countries. n34 More importantly, a significant share of this increase has gone to the poorest people. The percentage of the population in developing countries living under $ 1 per day has fallen from 30% to 24% in the past decade. n35 The recent experience of Mexico offers an excellent example of global capitalism in action. The extent of poverty in Mexico is shocking; 20 million people live on less than $ 2 per day. n36 This is so for a number of reasons, including government intervention in the market in the form of protectionist measures intended to help ailing or failing industries. Using government interventions to shape the allocation of resources traditionally led to gross inefficiencies and a low pace of innovation and adoption of new technologies. n37 Trade liberalization has helped curb such interventions - indeed, the opening of its markets has become one of the most important and far-reaching reforms in Mexico. The effects of trade liberalization on the Mexican economy have been significant. Exports in Mexico have increased sixfold since 1985, and the GDP of the country has grown at an average rate of 5.4% per year since 1996. n38 Since NAFTA created a "free trade area" among the United States, Canada, and Mexico in 1994, Mexican labor productivity has grown fast in its tradable sectors. n39 Not surprisingly, however, productivity has remained stagnant in nontradable sectors. n40 NAFTA has also improved Mexico's aggregate trade balance and helped to ameliorate the effect of the [\*100] peso crisis on capital flows. n41 As most economists predicted during the NAFTA debate, the effects of the agreement have been positive and large for Mexico. n42 The effects have also been positive, although smaller, for the United States. This is also consistent with the pre-NAFTA analyses of most economists. n43 The positive effects of globalization have been consistent throughout the developing world. Dramatic increases in per capita income have accompanied the expansion of trade in countries that have become more globalized. Korea, for example, has seen average incomes increase eightfold since 1960. n44 China has experienced an average growth of 5.1% during the same period, and other countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America have experienced faster growth than that in advanced countries. n45 The evidence is incredibly one-sided. "[P]romoting openness, and supporting it with sound domestic policies, leads to faster growth."

### Capitalism Good – War

Global economic liberalism solves war between great powers

Griswold, Associated Director of the Center for Trade Policy Studies at the CATO Institute in Washington, 02

(Daniel, “seven Moral Arguments for Free Trade,” The Insider, 01 May, http://www.insideronline.org/feature.cfm?id=106)

In an 1845 speech in the British House of Commons, Richard Cobden called free trade “that advance which is calculated to knit nations more together in the bonds of peace by means of commercial intercourse.” Free trade does not guarantee peace, but it does strengthen peace by raising the cost of war to governments and their citizens. As nations become more integrated through expanding markets, they have more to lose should trade be disrupted.

In recent years, the twin trends of globalization and democratization have produced their own “peace dividend”: since 1987, real spending on armaments throughout the world has dropped by more than one-third. Since the end of the Cold War, the threat of major international wars has receded. Those nations most closely associated with international terrorism – Libya, Sudan, Syria, Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan, and North Korea – are among the least globalized countries in the world in terms of non-oil trade and foreign investment. Not one of them belongs to the World Trade Organization.

During the 1930s, the industrialized nations waged trade wars against each other. They raised tariffs and imposed quotas in order to protect domestic industry. The result, however, was that other nations only raised their barriers even further, choking off global trade and deepening and prolonging the global economic depression. Those dark economic times contributed to the conflict that became World War II. America’s post-war policy of encouraging free trade through multilateral trade agreements was aimed at promoting peace as much as it was prosperity.

### Capitalism Good – War

And Neoliberalism solves internal state violence

Tures, Assistant Professor of Political Science at LaGrange College, 2003

(John A., http://www.cato.org/pubs/journal/cj22n3/cj22n3-9.pdf)

The last three decades have witnessed an unprecedented expansion of market-based reforms and the profusion of economic freedom in the international system. This shift in economic policy has sparked a debate about whether free markets are superior to state controls. Numerous studies have compared the neoliberal and statist policies on issues of production capacity, economic growth, commercial volumes, and egalitarianism. An overlooked research agenda, however, is the relationship between levels of economic freedom and violence within countries. Proponents of the statist approach might note that a strong government can bend the market to its will, directing activity toward policies necessary to achieve greater levels of gross domestic product and growth. By extracting more resources for the economy, a powerful state can redistribute benefits to keep the populace happy. Higher taxes can also pay for an army and police force that intimidate people. Such governments range from command economies of totalitarian systems to autocratic dictators and military juntas. Other economically unfree systems include some of the authoritarian “Asian tigers.” A combination of historical evidence, modern theorists, and statistical findings, however, has indicated that a reduced role for the state in regulating economic transactions is associated with a decrease in internal conflicts. Countries where the government dominates the commercial realm experience an increase in the level of domestic violence. Scholars have traced the history of revolutions to explain the relationship between statism and internal upheavals. Contemporary authors also posit a relationship between economic liberty and peace. Statistical tests show a strong connection between economic freedom and conflict reduction during the past three decades.

### Capitalism Good – Inequality

Neoliberalism solves global inequality

Obhof, Graduate of Yale Law School, 2003

(“WHY GLOBALIZATION? A LOOK AT GLOBAL CAPITALISM AND ITS EFFECTS”. University of Florida Journal of Law & Public Policy. Fall 2003)

Many in the anti-globalization camp have focused their efforts on rising tensions within, rather than between, countries. They argue that the rich and the poor are drifting farther apart, and that violence between classes of people within the same country is increasing. Noting that economic groups often tend to break down along ethnic lines, some have even postulated that the spread of free-market democracy fosters "ethnoeconomic resentment" to the point of conflagration. n171 On their collective face, these arguments appear to have some merit. Intrastate war is now the [\*121] predominant form of armed conflict. n172 In the last decade, civil wars "have scarred the world's poorest countries, leaving a legacy of more than five million dead, many more driven from their homes, billions of dollars in resources destroyed, and wasted economic opportunity." n173 Is the spread of global capitalism responsible for these atrocities? The answer is likely no. Such analyses often overlook more obvious sources of backlash: elite behavior, corruption, and latent ethnic, nationalist, and religious tensions. n174 They also ignore historical and economic realities. As discussed above, there is no correlation between globalization and increased inequality within countries - in fact, the opposite is true. Furthermore, the risk factors most closely correlated with civil war include the share of GDP coming from the export of primary commodities, geography, recent conflicts, economic opportunities, and ethnic and religious composition. n175 Since the end of the Cold War, conflict has been concentrated in countries with little education and economic decline. n176 Intrastate conflict is systematically related to low national income n177 and a lack of economic opportunities, n178 but not inequality. n179 Unequal societies are simply not more prone to conflict than more egalitarian ones. Given the importance of economic opportunity in preventing conflict, and the unequivocally positive results of increased trade and foreign investment, it seems that global capitalism is a potential cure, rather than a cause, of internal conflict. In fact, internal pressures appear to be greater [\*122] in countries that have not become more globalized in recent years. Whatever the merits of this latter claim, though, the assertion that globalization has increased internal conflict is simply not supported by the facts.

### Capitalism Good – Inequality

[ ] Inequality increases without free trade and Neoliberalism

Obhof, Graduate of Yale Law School, 2003

(“WHY GLOBALIZATION? A LOOK AT GLOBAL CAPITALISM AND ITS EFFECTS”. University of Florida Journal of Law & Public Policy. Fall 2003)

B. Openness and Between-Country Inequality Has globalization led to greater inequality between developed and developing countries? That depends on how one interprets the question. Data indicates that globalization may have decreased income inequality between developed and globalizing developing countries. During the 1990s, per capita income grew faster in developing countries that were open to international trade than in developed countries by a ratio of more than two-to-one. n71 Per capita income experienced little or no growth, however, in countries that did not globalize. The income gap therefore increased between non-globalizing, undeveloped countries and developed countries. The difference in performance between globalizing and non-globalizing countries accounts for the general lack of convergence between rich and poor countries taken together.

### Capitalism Good – Democracy

Neoliberalism helps spread democracy which helps decrease war

Griswold, Associated Director of the Center for Trade Policy Studies at the CATO Institute in Washington, 2007

(Daniel, “Trade, Democracy and Peace: The Virtuous Cycle,” 20 April 2007, http://www.freetrade.org/node/681)

The good news does not stop there. Buried beneath the daily stories about suicide bombings and insurgency movements is an underappreciated but encouraging fact: The world has somehow become a more peaceful place. A little-noticed headline on an Associated Press story a while back reported, "War declining worldwide, studies say." In 2006, a survey by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute found that the number of armed conflicts around the world has been in decline for the past half-century. Since the early 1990s, ongoing conflicts have dropped from 33 to 17, with all of them now civil conflicts within countries. The Institute's latest report found that 2005 marked the second year in a row that no two nations were at war with one another. What a remarkable and wonderful fact. The death toll from war has also been falling. According to the Associated Press report, "The number killed in battle has fallen to its lowest point in the post-World War II period, dipping below 20,000 a year by one measure. Peacemaking missions, meanwhile, are growing in number." Current estimates of people killed by war are down sharply from annual tolls ranging from 40,000 to 100,000 in the 1990s, and from a peak of 700,000 in 1951 during the Korean War. Many causes lie behind the good news--the end of the Cold War and the spread of democracy, among them--but expanding trade and globalization appear to be playing a major role in promoting world peace. Far from stoking a "World on Fire," as one misguided American author argued in a forgettable book, growing commercial ties between nations have had a dampening effect on armed conflict and war. I would argue that free trade and globalization have promoted peace in three main ways. First, as I argued a moment ago, trade and globalization have reinforced the trend toward democracy, and democracies tend not to pick fights with each other. Thanks in part to globalization, almost two thirds of the world's countries today are democracies--a record high. Some studies have cast doubt on the idea that democracies are less likely to fight wars. While it's true that democracies rarely if ever war with each other, it is not such a rare occurrence for democracies to engage in wars with non-democracies. We can still hope that has more countries turn to democracy, there will be fewer provocations for war by non-democracies.

### Capitalism Good – Environment

Environment getting better now and its because of growth and tech innovation

Bailey, award-winning science correspondent for Reason magazine, 2k

(Ronald, “[Earth Day, Then and Now](http://reason.com/archives/2000/05/01/earth-day-then-and-now) The planet's future has never looked better. Here's why.”, <http://reason.com/archives/2000/05/01/earth-day-then-and-now/4>)

Earth Day 1970 provoked a torrent of apocalyptic predictions. "We have about five more years at the outside to do something," ecologist Kenneth Watt declared to a Swarthmore College audience on April 19, 1970. Harvard biologist George Wald estimated that "civilization will end within 15 or 30 years unless immediate action is taken against problems facing mankind." "We are in an environmental crisis which threatens the survival of this nation, and of the world as a suitable place of human habitation," wrote Washington University biologist Barry Commoner in the Earth Day issue of the scholarly journal Environment. The day after Earth Day, even the staid New York Times editorial page warned, "Man must stop pollution and conserve his resources, not merely to enhance existence but to save the race from intolerable deterioration and possible extinction." Very Apocalypse Now. Three decades later, of course, the world hasn't come to an end; if anything, the planet's ecological future has never looked so promising. With half a billion people suiting up around the globe for Earth Day 2000, now is a good time to look back on the predictions made at the first Earth Day and see how they've held up and what we can learn from them. The short answer: The prophets of doom were not simply wrong, butspectacularly wrong. More important, many contemporary environmental alarmists are similarly mistaken when they continue to insist that the Earth's future remains an eco-tragedy that has already entered its final act. Such doomsters not only fail to appreciate the huge environmental gains made over the past 30 years, they ignore the simple fact that increased wealth, population, and technological innovation don't degrade and destroy the environment. Rather, such developments preserve and enrich the environment. If it is impossible to predict fully the future, it is nonetheless possible to learn from the past. And the best lesson we can learn from revisiting the discourse surrounding the very first Earth Day is that passionate concern, however sincere, is no substitute for rational analysis.